FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Middle East & North Africa

Vol V No 16 *24 January 1978*

INTER-ARAB AFFAIRS

Yasir 'Arafat Address to PLA Commanders [VOP] A 1 1/A6
'Arafat Addresses Palestinian Red Crescent [VOP] A 4 1/A9
Fatah Leader Replies to As-Sadat's Assembly Speech [VOP] A 5 1/A10

ARABIAN PENINSULA

KUWAIT

Foreign Ministry Officials, Soviet Envoy Discuss Middle East C 1 1/A11

SAUDI ARABIA

VOP Reports on 'Arafat's Activities in Riyadh C 1 1/A11
Somali President Siad Barre Meets With Saudis C 2 1/A12
Horn of Africa Discussed C 2 1/A12
Meets With Deputy Prime Minister C 2 1/A12
U.S. Senator McClure Criticizes Israel's Stand C 2 1/A12
'UKAZ on Vance's Statements in Jerusalem [18 Jan 78] C 3 1/A13
'UKAZ on U.S. Responsibility for Talks Failure [22 Jan 78] C 4 1/A14

YEMEN--PDRY

Restoration of Ties With U.S. Requested C 4 1/A14

EGYPT

Foreign Ministry Source on Egyptian-Israeli Committees D 1 1/B1
Foreign Minister Comments on Begin's Knesset Speech D 1 1/B1
Cairo Radio Reports Speech D 1 1/B1
Further Reportage on Cyrus Vance Visit to Cairo D 2 1/B2
Conclusion of Expanded Talks D 2 1/B2
As-Sadat-Vance Press Conference D 2 1/B2
Report on Vance Departure D 6 1/B6
AL-AHRAM on Talks D 7 1/B7
Ghali Notes Importance of Self-Determination for Palestinians D 7 1/B7
Ghali: Israel Cannot Have Both Territory, Peace [Paris LE MONDE 21 Jan 78] D 8 1/B8
As-Sadat Meetings With Egyptian Officials Reported D 10 1/B10
Receives Mubarak, Kamil D 10 1/B10
Meets With Mubarak, At-Tuhami D 10 1/B10

Foreign Minister To Report to Assembly Committees D 10 1/B10
UN Delegate Al-Majid Leaves for Washington 24 Jan D 10 1/B10
Libyan Intelligence Agent Reported Executed 24 Jan D 11 1/B11
YAR Foreign Minister Al-Asnaj Arrives in Cairo 23 Jan D 11 1/B11
Meets With Kamil D 11 1/B11
Sudanese Defense Minister Concludes Cairo Visit D 12 1/B12
Meeting With Al-Jamasi D 12 1/B12
Departure for Khartoum D 12 1/B12
AL-AHRAM: Egypt Opposes U.S. Sale of F-16's to Israel D 12 1/B12
AL-AKHBAR: Soviets May Step in if Peace Talks Fail D 12 1/B12
AL-AKHBAR Responds to Kosygin Statement on Egypt [17 Jan 78] D 12 1/B12
As-Sadat Thanks King Hassan for Moroccan Support D 14 1/B14
AL-AKHBAR: U.S. Must Define Its Position Toward Peace D 15 1/C1
Ghali, Cuban Ambassador Discuss Bilateral Relations D 15 1/C1

IRAQ

Italian Communist Party Delegation Arrives in Baghdad E 1 1/C2
Omani Interior Minister Arrives for 3-Day Visit E 1 1/C2
Trade Minister Meets With Envoys to Arab Countries E 1 1/C2
Oil Delegation Leaves for Meeting in New Delhi E 1 1/C2

JORDAN

King Husayn Interviewed on Palestinian Problem F 1 1/C3
Amman Radio Defines Stand on Current Peace Talks F 5 1/C7
AD-DUSTUR Comments on Begin Knesset Speech F 6 1/C8
Qatari Foreign Minister Arrives in Amman F 6 1/C8

SYRIA

Foreign Minister Calls for Isolation of Egypt H 1 1/C9
Cabinet Hears Review of Mideast Developments by Khulayfawi H 1 1/C9
Front Issues Statement Supporting Al-Asad's Nomination H 2 1/C10

NORTH AFRICA

ALGERIA

Paper Reports Algeria To Receive Soviet Tanks Soon I 1 1/C11

LIBYA

JANA Reports on 22 Jan Oil Conference in Tripoli I 1 1/C11
Mali Foreign Minister Conveys Message to Jallud I 2 1/C12
Soviet Deputy Agricultural Minister Ends Visit I 3 1/C13
Briefs: Tripoli-Cuban Agreement I 3 1/C13

MOROCCO

Hassan Gives Press Conference on Ties With Spain I 4 1/C14
King Hassan Sends Message to King Husayn I 5 1/D1

TUNISIA

Report on Destourian Party Central Committee Session I 5 1/D1
President, Prime Minister Receive French Chief of Staff I 8 1/D4

ISRAEL

Begin Addresses Knesset on Peace Talks With Egypt N 1 1/D5
Speech Said To Be Softened N 12 1/E2
Peres Addresses Knesset N 12 1/E2
Dayan Statement in Debate N 18 1/E8
Further on Dayan Remarks N 18 1/E8
Rabin, Dayan Statements N 18 1/E8
Knesset Endorses Begin Statement N 19 1/E9
Minister Weizman Postpones Visit to U.S. N 20 1/E10
Husayn Talk With West Bank Personages Reported N 20 1/E10

SOUTH ASIA

BANGLADESH

Bangladesh-India Joint Rivers Commission Meets S 1 1/E11
Concludes Session S 1 1/E11
Commodity Exchange Protocol With PRC Finalized S 1 1/E11

INDIA

Vajpayee To Make Official Visit to Pakistan S 2 1/E12
Defense Spokesman Comments on Increased Arms Production S 2 1/E12

PAKISTAN

Haq Establishes 16-Member Council of Advisers [Karachi DAWN 15 Jan 78] S 2 1/E12

J Kn 956-B-6 P.Ex 7.10: FBIS-MEA-78-16

FEB 7 1978

FBIS-MEA-78-16
Tuesday
24 January 1978
Vol V No 16

DAILY REPORT

COMPLETED
ORIGINAL
CONTIN

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

Available for Distribution
From NTIS

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

This publication contains current news and commentary monitored by FBIS from foreign broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, and periodicals. Items are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign-language sources are translated by FBIS. Those from English-language sources are transcribed, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [ ] are supplied by FBIS. Labels such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how FBIS processed the information from the original. Names rendered phonetically or in transliteration are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clearly heard but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source.

Users of this publication may cite FBIS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying it as the secondary source. For example: "FBIS reports that Radio Moscow announced . . ." or "FBIS has monitored a broadcast from Hanoi which says . . ."

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

YASIR 'ARAFAT ADDRESS TO PLA COMMANDERS

JN211715Y Voice of Palestine [Clandestine] in Arabic to Arab World 1520 GMT 21 Jan 78 JN

[Text of speech delivered by PLO Executive Committee Chairman Yasir 'Arafat 20 January at a meeting of commanders, officers and cadres of the Palestine Liberation Army [PLA] and the Palestine armed struggle command [fedayeen military police]--place of meeting not given; read by announcer]

[Text] Brothers, I am honored by this meeting with my brothers in the PLA, especially in the difficult and serious circumstances through which our cause and Arab nation are now passing in the face of the fast-moving events in our Arab region and the intensive plots which have begun to be very clear in this region, through the planning of the United States.

We have seen what has happened after As-Sadat's visit, which was followed by Begin's visit to Egypt, and later, by the political talks. We have heard what the enemy said. This proves what we have been saying and what 'Abd an-Nasir once reiterated: What was taken by force can only be retrieved by force. It also proves that we in the Palestinian revolution are facing a long and bitter struggle with this arrogant enemy, which is fully backed by the United States.

I firmly believe that Israel is not a Jewish state, but a bridge for colonialism and imperialism in our Arab region, protecting colonialist and imperialist interests and also protecting neoimperialism in our Arab region. It is a bridge through which they are trying to impose their wish and domination on this Arab region.

If we go back a little, we will find that the Zionist movement began at the Basle conference in 1897. That year marked the first discovery of oil in Iraq. Israel was established in 1947, which marked the first discovery of oil in the gulf. Thus we understand that the basic task of this tiny state, or imperialist base, is a colonialist and an imperialist one. It is manipulated by the United States in order to impose its domination on our Arab region, which contains the largest oil reserves in the world.

When we speak about oil, we mean the blood running through the arteries of the world in this age. They want oil until it dries up or a substitute source of energy is found. Thus, brothers, we understand why they are after this region.

I said yesterday that during the political negotiations in Jerusalem, an American decision was adopted giving 150 F-15's and F-16's to the Zionist enemy. This decision could not have been inadvertent. It was a decision based on the determination to continue the imperialist plots against our Arab region. I do not understand this to mean that Begin is brave. Never. Begin is a terrorist who knows the size of Israel, which he set up on the debris of our homeland and the bodies of our people. Begin knows the exact size of Israel and will know when the battle really starts in this region. Ben-Gurion once said that they cannot suffer a single defeat, but the Arab nation can take 1 blow, 2 blows or 10 blows and yet the fighting will continue.

Despite all planned attempts to foil our struggle and despite all the attempts to contain and control the Palestinian revolution, this nation can, with time, impose its wish. This nation was defeated by the Tatars and later by the English and French crusaders. This nation will inevitably defeat the Zionist invasion. There is no doubt about that. The important thing is that we must have a strong will--the will to fight. They are trying to kill this will to fight, this will which is brilliantly and truly exemplified by the Palestinian revolution, the will to fight and the continuation of the revolution until victory--this is what the plot is aiming at now.

Why is the plot concentrating against the Palestinian revolution? Why is it that every-time he speaks, Begin says the Palestinians, the Palestinian revolution and the PLO have failed [words indistinct]. Carter, Brzezinski, Peres and others say the same thing. All these people speak against the Palestinian revolution. Why? Because they know what the Palestinian revolution represents, this revolution which started 13 years ago and has now entered its 14th year despite all the plots being hatched against it, the tens of thousands we sacrificed, and the tens of thousands of Palestinians in prisons.

Nevertheless, our revolution continues. It is getting stronger and increasing its support on the Palestinian, Arab and international levels.

Therefore, everyone is a target, because they know that the mere striking at the Palestinian revolution means the destruction of the most important fortress of our Arab nation. This fortress moves the conscience and sentiments of the Arab nation, because the Palestinian revolution at present represents the vanguard of the Arab area. The Palestinian revolution is now the struggle identity, exactly as the Algerian revolution was once the struggle identity of the Arab nation. The Arab nation's struggle identity at present is the Palestinian revolution.

Therefore, the Palestinian revolution is a target, because they want to destroy this struggle identity. However, brothers, in the same way that the Algerian revolutionaries won victory, our Palestinian revolutionaries will also win victory. This is the inevitable course of history. What is important is how we act. Why are we carrying guns on our backs? Is it for the sake of military titles? Our fate is either to be martyred, to be captured or to win victory. There is no alternative.

This, brothers, is your responsibility, and it is a (?big) responsibility. [words indistinct] The PLA is the army of the Palestinian people. You know that there are countless plots concocted against this army with the aim of weakening and destroying it. Therefore, you must shoulder a very big responsibility. You must shoulder the responsibility and destroy the plot on the rock of your steadfastness. I am deeply convinced that the plot will be destroyed, because the faces I see in front of me can shoulder enormous responsibilities so that this flag might remain high, this gun pointed, the will of fighting present, and the revolution continuing and moving ahead. We will continue on this path until victory is achieved.

The idea of settlement [settling Palestinians in other Arab countries] they are talking about, we do not want this settlement. Many offers have been made to us for settlement, in Jordan, for example. We were also offered settlement in Sinai. It was also offered to us in Iraq. Had we been in favor of settlement, we would have accepted it a long time ago. Our great people reject this, despite all the plots being concocted against them. Our people, in their hearts, consciences and sentiments, are still looking forward to settlement in Jaffa, Haifa, Jerusalem, Galilee, Beersheba and Nazereth. This is the spirit of our people and this is the secret of the greatness of our people. This is the Palestinian phenomenon.

Despite all the plots which have been going on for 30 years, our people have not forgotten. One day, when they were drafting the outlines of the Eisenhower doctrine, Dulles was asked about the Palestinian people. He said it is unfortunate for the Palestinian people to have been caught in the middle. Dulles was then asked [words indistinct] and then will come generations which will not know Palestine, and the problem will be over.

Would that Dulles could now see that 80 or 85 percent of those who are fighting now were not born in Palestine but outside Palestine. They go to Palestine to be martyred and to die on its soil. Their pure blood mixes with the soil of Palestine. These are facts. Today 85 percent of those who are carrying the guns have never seen Palestine. This is the secret of the Palestinian revolution.

Therefore, I tell Dulles, the allies of Dulles and the successors of Dulles that our people are (?firm) in this Arab area. The Palestinian revolution is (?firm) in this Arab area and is the essential factor in the formula. No one can contain, dominate or bypass this revolution. This revolution is proceeding on its path, is proving itself and is carving rocks with its own hands.

This revolution is a miracle despite all the plots concocted against it and despite all the sacrifices we are making. We are proving that this revolution is a gigantic one.

Therefore, brothers, we must further rally our ranks, have more faith in the gun, make further sacrifices, give further and fight further until victory is achieved.

National unity exists in the ranks of the Palestinian people. It exists among the factions of the resistance movement and is being consolidated day after day. We are not talking about national unity as if it is [words indistinct]. Without national unity no victory can be scored. This is a thing which we believe in. Developments will prove that the revolutionaries of the Palestinian revolution are always capable of coping with the (?vilest and biggest) plots and maneuvers through their unity, cohesion and solidarity. We have always raised the slogan "one gun added to a thousand guns is new strength."

God willing, brothers, I will meet with you again in our country, [words indistinct] or some of those who are sitting with us here will sit with us in Jerusalem. You will remember these difficult days. However, they are historic days, despite all the bitterness and plots, despite the bloodbath which has not stopped for this revolution for a single moment. The bloodbath, brothers, has not stopped for a single day. We are now in the 14th year, and the bloodbath has not stopped for this Palestinian revolution for a single day. We daily offer martyrs or wounded.

This revolution has enormous burdens to shoulder. However, I am sure that through the cooperation of its heroes we will be able to shoulder these burdens. Brothers, blessed are those who are living in these historic days because they are days inscribed in history in letters of light and fire. [sentence indistinct] These people in the occupied homeland are the best example [words indistinct] despite all the pressure applied to them from the Jordanian and Israeli sides.

The last document submitted to the Political Committee, which failed to complete its meetings in Jerusalem [words indistinct] are inseparable [words indistinct]. We are fighting and struggling with these people. We [words indistinct] in the solidity of this people which we depend upon and who are inseparable from the heritage of our great, immortal Arab nation which has repulsed and crushed all the invaders throughout history.

It will, likewise crush Begin and his ilk and the arrogant and conceited imperialist terrorists and expel them from the area. We will remain together side by side until victory is achieved.

'ARAFAT ADDRESSES PALESTINIAN RED CRESCENT

JN2016347 Voice of Palestine [Clandestine] in Arabic to Arab World 1500 GMT 20 Jan 78 JN

[Excerpts] Brother Abu 'Ammar reviewed recent developments pertaining to the Palestinian cause at the meeting of the Administrative Council of the Palestinian Red Crescent Society in Beirut yesterday. The following is brother Abu 'Ammar's speech [read by announcer]: The Palestinian Red Crescent is part of the Palestinian revolution. It is even one of its mainstays in view of its humanitarian task. I should point out that humanitarian work cannot be complete without the existence of a free and independent homeland. Therefore, we in the Palestinian revolution are striving to recover our homeland and regain our legitimate rights to all our Palestinian soil so that we may carry out our humanitarian task in the most perfect way.

We are proud of the strong ties which link us with liberation movements all over the world--in Latin America; Quebec, Canada; Asia and Africa. In view of this fact, I tell you that the Palestinian revolution is now making great efforts to stop the fighting between Vietnam and Cambodia. It will also not hesitate to carry out any revolutionary task which circumstances may require in any country of the struggling world. This is at the time when we are struggling to recover Palestine.

It is true that the Palestinian revolution is passing through a critical stage. However, this should not be a cause for despair but should increase our determination to adhere to our rights and to struggle to regain them in full. This cannot come about through negotiations but through continuing the fighting, in line with the famous saying of the late President Jamal 'Abd an-Nasir that what was taken by force can only be regained by force. Certain rulers who believe that they can regain the occupied territories through negotiations with the enemy are dreaming. The Zionist entity will never give up one inch of land unless it is forced to do so.

We realize that it is not Israel which is fighting us, but U.S. imperialism, which is trying to control Arab energy sources. For this reason, it is throwing all its weight into the battle alongside Israel. You may recall that on the day the Egyptian-Israeli Political Committee opened its meetings in Jerusalem, Washington announced the conclusion of an arms deal consisting of 150 F-15 and F-16 fighter planes.

The United States is trying to impose its influence in the area. It is no secret that the main headache for the White House leaders is the Palestinian revolution. I have counted 17 U.S. statements attacking the PLO within 20 days.

U.S. imperialism sought to strike at the Palestinian resistance by fabricating the bloody events in Lebanon in 1975 and 1976 in order to permit the second Sinai agreement to be implemented. It is now trying to rekindle the sedition in Lebanon in order to impose surrender on us. However, the United States will fail and its plots will fail. Our people adhere to their revolution and principles. They will not lay down arms until they achieve all their aims, foremost of which is the liberation of Palestine.

FATAH LEADER REPLIES TO AS-SADAT's ASSEMBLY SPEECH

JN231813Y Voice of Palestine [Clandestine] in Arabic to Arab World 1500 GMT 23 Jan 78 JN

[Text] Brother Abu Iyad, member of the Fatah Central Committee, has renewed the call for resisting As-Sadat and his supporters. Egypt is great only when it has a great leader, he said.

This came in the speech which Abu Iyad delivered yesterday at the public rally commemorating the second anniversary of the martyrs of Ad-Dubayyah, Al-Maslakh, Al-Karantinah and [words indistinct]. Replying to the speech which President as-Sadat delivered the day before yesterday before the Egyptian People's Assembly, Abu Iyad refuted all As-Sadat's claims and maneuverings and said: After Israel's arrogance and intransigence, everyone had expected As-Sadat to tell the truth to his people and nation. Instead, he said the USSR is hampering peace.

Abu Iyad continued: As-Sadat is proud to say that the United States cleared the Suez Canal free of charge. But let us ask: Is it not true that Egypt's debts to the USSR amounted to billions after 1967? 'Abd an-Nasir was in power then. Yet the Soviet leaders re-equiped the Egyptian Army, making up for everything lost in the war. As-Sadat does not remember this.

Abu Iyad added: The Soviets are not ready to give arms in order to get rid of all the nationalist regimes in Africa.

Concerning As-Sadat's request for arms from the United States, Abu Iyad said: I defy As-Sadat to get any arms from the United States. It is the United States which created the Begin alliance. What has the United States given As-Sadat in the past 4 years? It gave him six transport planes. Does it not show disregard for the Egyptian people and army, scorn for Arab mentality and contempt for Arab dignity?

Replying to As-Sadat's statement that Sinai is not the main issue, Abu Iyad said that Sinai is the main issue [words indistinct]. He also affirmed: The required Palestinian state will not be for Al-Ja'bari and such agents, but will be for us. We need a base [qa'idah] for the revolutionaries who have struggled and who are an extension of the Arab revolution.

Abu Iyad announced that there will be no peace in this region without the Palestinian people and the Palestinian revolutionaries. He said: Begin has not given us an inch of our territory, because on 1 January 1965 we fired the first shot at Israel. Begin cannot forgive this crime. We and all those who have taken up arms are rejected by Israel.

Abu Iyad warned of the current propaganda campaigns which aim at (?collaboration) with the enemy and said: We tell these people that they are deluded. We are the owners of the land. This nation has never disowned its land.

Abu Iyad called for keeping the liberation flag unblemished by capitulation or surrender.

KUWAIT

FOREIGN MINISTRY OFFICIAL, SOVIET ENVOY DISCUSS MIDDLE EAST

LD1817387 Kuwait AS-SIYASAH in Arabic 17 Jan 78 p 2 LD

[Text] Foreign Ministry Undersecretary Rashid 'Abd al-'Aziz received the Soviet ambassador to Kuwait at 1030 yesterday.

The undersecretary stated that he discussed developments in the Middle East and the international political situation with the ambassador. He said that he reaffirmed to the ambassador Kuwait's firm stand on the developments in the Arab area, its commitment to the resolutions of Arab summit conferences, and its desire to unify the Arab ranks and work for joint Arab actions.

The Soviet ambassador told the undersecretary that the Soviet Union believes that joint Arab action is necessary and that there must be Arab rapprochement and joint Arab action.

Concerning the renewed call by the Yemen Arab Republic for an Arab summit conference, he said: If the renewed call for an Arab summit is for the purpose of achieving joint Arab action it is well and good, because only the enemy benefits from Arab division. Any Arab division is harmful to all of us.

Concerning the visit of the Maltese prime minister to Kuwait and whether a date has been fixed, the undersecretary said that no date has yet been fixed and that relations between Malta and Kuwait are good as officials of both countries are in constant contact.

SAUDI ARABIA

VOP REPORTS ON 'ARAFAT'S ACTIVITIES IN RIYADH

JN2315047 Voice of Palestine [Clandestine] in Arabic to Arab World 1400 GMT 23 Jan 78 JN

[Text] A second round of talks was held yesterday between brother Abu 'Ammar, chairman of the PLO Executive Committee and commander in chief of the revolution forces, and Prince Fahd ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz, Saudi crown prince. A comprehensive review was made of the current Arab situation. The discussion dealt with the situation in Lebanon in particular in light of recent developments.

Brother Abu 'Ammar affirmed that the Palestinian revolution is determined to establish national reconciliation in Lebanon, as this is the basis for Lebanese unity and normalcy among all the Lebanese communities and groups. He said that the Palestinian revolution is ready to exert efforts for the unity of the ranks and opinion in Lebanon among the sons of the one people. Brother Abu 'Ammar cautioned against the gravity of the Zionist plots being hatched against Lebanon. He stressed that the Zionist enemy continues to be active in southern Lebanon to restart fighting in Lebanon and pave the way for his expansionist designs in southern Lebanon.

Brother Abu 'Ammar also held side working meetings with Prince Salman ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz, governor of Riyadh, and several Saudi officials. Another meeting was held between brother Abu 'Ammar and a number of Palestinian brothers working in Saudi Arabia. Brother Abu 'Ammar briefed them on recent political developments, pointing out that the United States is continuing its campaign against the PLO and the Palestinian people in order to peddle capitulatory solutions at the expense of our people.

At this meeting, brother Abu 'Ammar emphasized that the Palestinian revolution and people will cling to their guns until victory is achieved.

SOMALI PRESIDENT SIAD BARRE MEETS WITH SAUDIS

Horn of Africa Discussed

LD231156Y Mogadiscio Domestic Service in Somali 0440 GMT 23 Jan 78 LD/EA

[Excerpt] Challe Mohamed Siad Barre, president of the Somali Democratic Republic, and the delegation led by him held talks with Saudi leaders in Riyadh yesterday afternoon. In these talks the Somali side was represented by Somali President Challe Mohamed Siad Barre; Challe Omar Arteh Ghalib, minister of culture and higher education; Challe Ibrahim Megag Samatur, chairman of administrative affairs of the Somali Revolutionary Socialist Party; Challe Abdurahman Nur Hersi, economic adviser of the president; and Challe Mohamed Sharif Mahmoud, director general of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs. The Saudi side was represented by Sa'ud al-Faysal Al Sa'ud, crown prince and foreign minister; and His Excellency [name indistinct], adviser of the king. The report says that the two sides discussed the problem of the Horn of Africa for 2 hours and came to identical conclusions on it.

Meets With Deputy Prime Minister

LD231548Y Riyadh Domestic Service in Arabic 1400 GMT 23 Jan 78 LD

[Excerpts] The second meeting in the talks between His Excellency Somali President Mohamed Siad Barre and His Royal Highness Amir Fahd ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz Al Sa'ud, the heir apparent and deputy prime minister, was held at the guest palace at 1115 today. Omar Arteh Ghalib, the Somali minister of higher education and the official spokesman of the Somali president, said that the Saudi-Somali talks have been useful and extremely successful, and were held in an atmosphere of understanding and identity of views on all topics discussed. He said that during the 3-hour meeting, discussions which began yesterday between Amir Fahd and the Somali president on the bilateral relations and the current situation in the Arab area and the Horn of Africa were completed.

U.S. SENATOR MCCLURE CRITICIZES ISRAEL'S STAND

LD231220Y Riyadh Domestic Service in Arabic 0600 GMT 23 Jan 78 LD

[Text] U.S. Senator James McClure stressed the special importance of the cooperation between Saudi Arabia and the United States to the stability of the world and the supply of energy. He said that his visit to the kingdom seeks to find out the views of the Saudi officials concerning a number of issues and to define the role which he can play to strengthen understanding between the two countries.

In a statement to the SAUDI NEWS AGENCY, U.S. Senator McClure expressed his belief that cooperation between the kingdom and the United States in finding energy sources to replace oil benefits the two countries. He noted that cooperation between the two countries in the field of solar energy is considered an excellent example of this type of cooperation. He said that the world appreciates the role of Saudi Arabia in maintaining oil prices and that Saudi Arabia is entitled to expect the United States to follow a realistic policy based on curbing the consumption of energy and developing new sources of energy in view of the serious increase in the rate of oil production.

Concerning the current situation in the Middle East, Senator McClure stressed the need for a peaceful and just settlement in the area. He also stressed the need for the United States to continue its efforts during the next few days to create favorable conditions once more for the resumption of peace negotiations.

Senator McClure criticized Israel's stubborn stand as shown in the peace talks between Egypt and Israel. He said that the United States has lately come to feel this stubbornness after Israel had the opportunity to hold direct negotiations, particularly as Israel had repeatedly claimed that the Arab states refuse the principle of direct negotiations with it.

He added that large numbers of Americans have been frustrated by the loss of the opportunity for peace that was brought about by the initiative of Egyptian President Anwar as-Sadat and that this loss raises the threat of another war in the area which would threaten the (?whole) world.

The American senator said that the American public now feels the need to review U.S. policy in the region to make it more balanced and that for 5 years he has been advocating in Congress that such a balanced policy toward the Arab-Israeli conflict be adopted, particularly as the Arab peoples harbor no hostility toward the American people.

'UKAZ ON VANCE'S STATEMENTS IN JERUSALEM

LD202338Y Jidda 'UKAZ in Arabic 18 Jan 78 p 1 LD

[Editorial]

[Text] The United States declared through Secretary of State Cyrus Vance's speech at the meetings of the Egyptian-Israeli Political Committee that normal relations are a condition for peace between the Arabs and Israel. This U.S. declaration is far removed from the reality of international relations, in that the United States itself for more than 20 years continued to refuse to establish diplomatic relations--which are part of normal relations--with China and Cuba, despite its substantial economic exchange and interests with both countries. Moreover, other countries refuse to recognize one another despite the fact that they deal with one another. There are many such examples in history.

Natural relations do not come about through coercion and enforcement, particularly in the case of the Arab-Israeli relations, which have been witness to more than 30 years of bloody conflict. The imposing of certain attitudes on the Arab and international situation cannot change things overnight. The situation resulting from military operations and the capture by Israel of Palestinian and Arab territories cannot be changed by merely issuing a decision to this effect. The only way for such relations to develop is to allow them to follow a natural course and to go through the stages of trial that follow the ending of the state of war. They would gradually become normal after a trial stage in which Israel must prove its ability to understand the various changes that brought about the conditions of peace.

Peace, therefore, does not necessarily mean the restoration of normal relations. This must be clear to all the parties that are striving to achieve a just peace, a peace free of hindrances and restrictions that could impede the establishment of peace in the Arab area.

The full realization of these facts would allow for the laying of strong foundations for peace that would remove the threat of war in the area, achieve stability for all countries and allow the period of trial and testing to overcome all the difficulties.

'UKAZ ON U.S. RESPONSIBILITY FOR TALKS FAILURE

LD231812Y Jidda 'UKAZ in Arabic 22 Jan 78 p 1 LD

[Editorial]

[Text] The real Israeli position has become quite clear to the whole world. No one disputes that Israel's expansionist ambitions are the reason for the failure of all the peace efforts. This stems from the Zionist ideals to which Israel is committed in both its position and policy.

This is not a new discovery by the Arabs, but the new thing that we must be aware of is the position of the United States. The United States has declared its commitment to a peaceful settlement in the area and is well aware that such a commitment is linked to the implementation of UN resolutions, several of which confirm the inadmissibility of occupying the land of other people by force and stress the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, which Israel has usurped. The United States is aware of all this and of the Arab view that rejects any encroachment on the occupied Arab territories, which is the major national objective for which the Arab nation has struggled for 30 years.

The United States is today responsible for the failure of the peace talks, a failure that will once again bring back to the area tension and instability and even the threat of war, a war in defense of legitimate Arab rights, because no nation can permit its territory to remain occupied.

The United States must learn from the lessons of the past, when the Soviet Union was able to infiltrate the Middle East and establish roots. The U.S. position was largely responsible for this infiltration; therefore, the United States must look back to history and consider the serious consequences that might result from the Russians' return to the Arab area as a result of Israel's intransigence and U.S. indecisiveness. It must also consider the time needed to oust the Russians from the area.

No one can say that the United States, which has given Israel material and military aid that has turned it into an armed garrison, is incapable of curbing this Israeli arrogance and intransigence which can lead to serious consequences and to upsetting the balance of power in the entire area.

Let the United States draw a lesson from 1956, when Israel occupied Arab lands, and the United States, under Eisenhower's leadership, refusing to allow the occupation of other people's land by force, forced Israel to withdraw within 2 months. The U.S. position is the decisive factor in the situation and on it depends the future of the Arab-Israeli conflict for several years to come.

YEMEN--PDRY

RESTORATION OF TIES WITH U.S. REQUESTED

NC190840Y Doha QNA in Arabic 0742 GMT 19 Jan 78 NC

[Text] Kuwait, 19 January--Today's issue of the Kuwaiti newspaper Al QABAS carries a report from Washington to the effect that the PDRY has sent an unofficial request to the U.S. Government seeking the resumption of diplomatic relations between the two countries. The paper writes that this request came in a message from PDRY President Salim Rubayyi' 'Ali to U.S. President Jimmy Carter. The message was handed to Paul Findley, member of the House International Relations Committee, during his recent visit to Aden.

FOREIGN MINISTRY SOURCE ON EGYPTIAN-ISRAELI COMMITTEES

NC231522Y Cairo Domestic Service in Arabic 1500 GMT 23 Jan 78 NC

[Text] An official source at the Foreign Ministry has told the radio correspondent that the political and military committees stemming from the Cairo preparatory conference continue to exist, that they are the framework through which the conference works and that no decision or statement has been issued by the Egyptian, Israeli, American or UN sides terminating the Cairo conference. The official source added that efforts are being made to remove the obstacles and that the presence of a number of the members of the Israeli military delegation in Cairo is evidence that the work has been frozen and not suspended. The source also said: There is no objection to the resumption of the work as soon as the obstacles are removed.

Commenting on the Israeli Government's decision to postpone the activities of the Military Committee, the source said: This is part of the bargaining which Israel is carrying out.

Concluding his statement, the source said that Egypt is holding continuous contacts with the Arab states to acquaint them with the developments of the situation.

FOREIGN MINISTER COMMENTS ON BEGIN'S KNESSET SPEECH

NC232019Y Cairo Domestic Service in Arabic 2000 GMT 23 Jan 78 NC

[Text] Commenting on Israeli Prime Minister Menahem Begin's statement today, Foreign Minister Muhammad Ibrahim Kamil said Israel must stop using stipulations [isntirata] because they constitute a kind of precondition. He said the sides could calmly redefine their stand and that in the light of the results of the next few days the talks may be resumed again.

Muhammad Ibrahim Kamil said: Our plan aims at arriving at specific foundations for continuing the talks--foundations which we have not yet reached. He added: In principle, the talks--whether they be the political or the military talks--could be resumed on the basis of principles. The foreign minister concluded by saying: Egypt cannot be accused of being anti-Semitic because we are also Semites.

Cairo Radio Reports Speech

NC232025Y Cairo Domestic Service in Arabic 1830 GMT 23 Jan 78 NC

[Text] Israeli Prime Minister Menahem Begin delivered a speech in the Israeli Knesset today in which he explained his government's position on the latest developments in the Middle East negotiations.

Begin opened his speech by admitting that President as-Sadat had made two basic conditions before his visit to Jerusalem with which to confront the Israeli Knesset. First, Israel's withdrawal to the borders existing before the 1967 war and second, the establishment of a Palestinian state. Begin pointed out that Israel's position is that it rejects withdrawal or the establishment of the Palestinian state on the pretext that this would threaten Israel's security. Begin announced Israel's insistence on the Sinai being a demilitarized zone and free from any forces, as he put it.

He said that the Egyptian side at the Ismailia meeting had submitted a proposal consisting of two clauses: First, Israel should commit itself to withdraw from the Sinai, the Golan Heights, the West Bank and Gaza; and second, Israel should agree to the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination. Begin alleged that UN Resolution 242 does not contain anything that commits Israel to withdraw to the pre-June 1967 borders. He added that he does not agree to the right of self-determination for the Palestinians.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON CYRUS VANCE VISIT TO CAIRO

Conclusion of Expanded Talks

NC201233Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 1224 GMT 20 Jan 78 NC

[Text] Cairo, 20 January--The expanded talks ended at 1345 today. Vance then had lunch with President as-Sadat. The luncheon was attended by members of the Egyptian and American delegations. Mrs Jihan as-Sadat as well as the wife of the vice president, and the wives of Cyrus Vance, Hermann Eilts and Dr Butrus Ghali also attended.

As-Sadat-Vance Press Conference

NC202036 Cairo Domestic Service in Arabic 1843 GMT 20 Jan 78 NC

[Text of 20 January joint press conference held by Egyptian President Anwar as-Sadat and U.S. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance in Cairo--recorded; in English with superimposed Arabic translation]

[Text] [As-Sadat] Ladies and Gentlemen, good morning. I must take this opportunity to express our gratitude to our friend President Carter and Secretary of State Vance for their sincere efforts, in the past few days, to surmount any differences between us and Israel. Minister of Foreign Affairs Muhammad Ibrahim Kamil submitted a report to me yesterday. I expressed to Secretary Vance my gratitude for all his help. I believe that the peace process must proceed toward what we are all seeking, namely peace.

Peace cannot be achieved through the establishment of settlements on the lands of others and by imposing these settlements and defending them. In fact, nobody in the world can understand such logic.

The road to peace is not closed, but a reassessment of the whole matter must be made at this moment because peace is incompatible with anything adversely affecting sovereignty or territory. This must be clear. I do not wish to comment on what Begin said in the Knesset yesterday. I believe that any person who reads his speech will realize that I was right because the Israelis want the land and everything. They are unprepared to understand that peace can only be achieved if it is based on justice.

We are not seeking peace at any price, not at all, and the Israelis will be mistaken to think so. The Israelis want to exist in this area under an umbrella of cooperation and recognition, despite the fact that Begin has arrogantly declared in the Knesset that he does not need anyone's recognition. Well, let us not start commenting on this, because this is the old arrogant way. Begin will realize today or tomorrow that Israel will gain absolutely nothing from this. Peace, as every human being in the whole world knows, means that no one should violate the territory of sovereignty of others. These are the principles which must be realized at this crucial moment.

I must also tell you that during our discussions--Secretary of State Cyrus Vance and I--something you may not have known before, and after President Carter contacted Vance and me, we agreed on the resumption of the Military Committee's work in Cairo just as it was agreed upon before. We have also agreed on maintaining constant contact between us in the future, as was the case before. Vance conveyed to me a message from President Carter and I asked Vance to convey a message from me to President Carter.

[Vance] Mr President, thank you very much. I wish to express my profound thanks to President as-Sadat for receiving me today. We had a great opportunity to exchange views in a comprehensive way regarding the present situation and future prospects.

As President as-Sadat has said, the door to peace is not closed. We are all seeking the same goal to achieve a just and lasting peace. As for the United States, we will continue to work with the parties concerned to consolidate this objective. We will maintain close contact in order to achieve this result. We will be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

[Question] Mr President, Mr secretary of state, the President's view will be sent by you, Mr Vance, to the Israelis. You have now reduced the momentum of the peace talks. Mr President, what are the conditions for resuming full talks once again?

[As-Sadat] Well, I see that you are using the word "conditions." They are not conditions at all. I say that peace means that no one should violate the territory or sovereignty of others.

[Question] I beg your pardon. May I continue what I was saying? Does this mean that the Israelis should issue a declaration containing a concession on the question of the settlements in Sinai?

[As-Sadat] What declaration?

[Question] I am saying that if you say that the condition for the resumption of the talks is that the sovereignty of others should not be encroached upon, does this mean that Israel should abandon its insistence on maintaining the settlements in Sinai, on Egyptian territory?

[As-Sadat] Yes. So far I have not received anything indicating a change in their position. As I have told you, I, on my part, really believe that it is more propaganda than reality.

[Question] If the Israelis were to abandon this attitude and say that they would give up the settlements in Sinai, would Egypt return to the political talks, full peace talks?

[As-Sadat] Well, let me say this: When Israel chooses to agree to the principle of the inviolability of the territory and sovereignty of others, then everything can be resumed.

[Question] Mr President, would you agree on resolving the question of self-determination for the Palestinians along with the development of the peace process, or would you insist on the adoption of a political resolution now, even before peace is established between Egypt and Israel?

[As-Sadat] Actually I do not understand the meaning of this question. We have all been working on preparing a declaration of principles in which Israel would express its intention to end the occupation of territories occupied in the 1967 war and to grant the Palestinians the right of self-determination.

However, I do not know what you mean when you say that peace has not been achieved between Egypt and Israel; therefore, they cannot agree on this. As I told you, we are working to prepare a comprehensive settlement. The minimum requirement to continue our work on a straight line must be present in this declaration of principles, that is, the withdrawal from the territories occupied in 1967 and self-determination. As for the time necessary to carry this out, this question is subject to negotiations. It can be agreed upon or negotiated in a state of affairs less serious than the one the Israelis are stirring up now.

[Question] Mr Vance, do you believe that a declaration of principles must include the right of the Palestinians to determine their future in the same manner as you had explained in your statement to the Political Committee and as President Carter declared in Aswan?

[Vance] The statement which President Carter made in Aswan reflects the views of the United States. In this statement, President Carter clearly declared that the United States believes that a resolution must be drawn enabling the Palestinians to participate in the events determining their future.

[Question] Mr Vance, will your delegation return to Jerusalem after Ankara and Greece?

[Vance] Yes. Mr Atherton will return to Jerusalem. There will be two or three others who will be part of the delegation.

[Question] Mr President, could you explain to us what went wrong, since the Ismailia summit conference, between you and Mr Begin?

[As-Sadat] Well, if you had read Prime Minister Begin's statement at a dinner 2 days ago and then read his speech in the Knesset yesterday, I believe you would find the answer to your question.

[Question] Mr President, please clarify a previous question that there can be no peace treaty regarding Sinai without first a declaration of principles?

[As-Sadat] We are not seeking, as I said, the ratification of a peace treaty regarding Sinai. We are seeking a comprehensive settlement. Such a comprehensive settlement must contain an agreement on specific principles.

[Question] Mr President, please, has Mr Vance presented any alternative solutions on behalf of the U.S. side and are these acceptable in relation to the declaration of principles?

[As-Sadat] Well, in fact, yes. We will study this. As I said, we will be in touch with him.

[Question] President as-Sadat and Secretary of State Vance, according to Mr Begin there are only two questions remaining before the Political Committee upon which no agreement has been reached. Do you agree with this assessment?

[Vance] There are some questions or principles contained in the draft declaration of principles which we were in the process of preparing. I would not like to go into details but I would say that there is one principle which is the most difficult one. This principle is connected with the Palestine problem and differences still exist about it. It is the most difficult question of all.

[As-Sadat] I completely agree with what the secretary of state has said.

[Question] Mr Vance, do we understand that a sort of an agreement was reached here in Cairo, which Mr Atherton will carry with him to Jerusalem, and has a sort of an understanding been reached with the Israelis for other moves or is there no change in the Israeli position?

[Vance] Yesterday I held talks with the prime minister and the minister of foreign affairs. Later, I also held further talks with Minister of Foreign Affairs Dayan. As a result of these talks, I believe that we made progress. I have acquainted President as-Sadat with what took place during these talks. We had an extremely good exchange of views in this respect. I believe that whatever will follow this, it must take place through calm talks. It is inappropriate for me to discuss this at a public press conference.

[Question] Mr President, you started the day by expressing gratitude to President Carter and Secretary of State Vance for the help they gave you in the past 2 days. Have they helped you regarding the substance of the question and procedures? Could you outline to us what the Americans have done?

[As-Sadat] Well, I do not believe it would be easy to reveal the details of what took place. However, I seize this opportunity to express my gratitude for what Secretary of State Vance has actually accomplished by exerting great efforts to overcome any differences between us. This is a fact. As for revealing what happened, a more suitable time than the present moment will come in the future to reveal this.

[Question] Mr President, when you returned from Jerusalem you said that if you did not achieve success in the peace process you would go to the People's Assembly and submit your resignation. There are speculations now that this is exactly what you intend to do tomorrow when you meet with the members of the People's Assembly. Is this the case and, if not, what will you tell them?

[As-Sadat] Well, it is a matter of time. In less than, or a little bit more than 24 hours, I will make my speech, tomorrow afternoon, to the People's Assembly. I advise you to wait until you hear my speech.

[Question] Just as a clarification, you have referred to the door being open to peace. Are you, Sir, in fact saying that if the Israelis were to issue a statement regarding the settlements, it would revive the peace talks, and what kind of statement do you specifically want?

[As-Sadat] I am afraid that you have not understood the real meaning of what I have actually said. It is specifically as Secretary of State Vance said, that there is an extremely vital point regarding the Palestinians on which we have not agreed. The question of the settlements and so on is another point of disagreement. But what really hurts me in fact is that the entire peace process has deviated from its right course because we are wasting time discussing, for example, the problem of the settlements when we should not be wasting time on them because, as I have said, this is ridiculous. Nobody will agree to have settlements imposed on his territory, or for someone to continue to be arrogant and to say we will defend the settlements. The Israelis did not adopt the right attitude. They are not serious at all about promoting peace based on justice.

Therefore, let us try to find the right course once again. I believe that in its dimension this course is much, much bigger than the problem of the settlements or anything like that.

[Question] In addition to that, Mr President, do you accept what President Carter has said about the Palestinians in relation to their legitimate rights and to enabling them to participate in determining their future? Are you satisfied with this exact wording, and would you agree to it if the Israelis did?

[As-Sadat] We agreed on this fact in Aswan, in President Carter's statement in Aswan. I still must say that Prime Minister Begin and his aides do not correctly understand the spirit of my initiative. This is why it is useless at present to continue with the peace process on this basis.

[Question] Mr President, it is felt in Israel that you are using the question of reconvening the Political Committee and then its suspension in order to create some pressure on Israel in the course of the negotiations. Would it not be better to use the framework of the Political Committee to settle conflicts of this nature?

[As-Sadat] This is once again the same logic. It is not pressure at all. I say that peace cannot be established while someone is violating the sanctity and sovereignty of the territory of others. You are using the same logic used in Israel. We absolutely do not agree with this. If an agreement is reached on this principle that no one must violate the sanctity or the sovereignty of the territory of others--this is a principle, not a condition; it is a fundamental principle essential for reaching an understanding in the future--then everything will be easy after that.

[Question] Mr President, but is it not the place for such a dispute in the framework of the Political Committee in Jerusalem?

[As-Sadat] Well, it appears, as I told you, that the appropriate course is that which we should have followed but there has been a deviation from the right course. Therefore, I called for adopting this stand. I am not putting pressure or setting conditions. I am just using logic. Can peace be achieved while someone is violating the sanctity of the territory of others and is persisting in his arrogance by saying that he will defend it also--my territory? Can peace be achieved in this way or by violating the sovereignty of others? These are not conditions. It would be like what your minister of foreign affairs said a few days ago, that we sit together, negotiate and bargain and then come halfway, or the like. What is halfway for us? The halfway for us is that we lose the land and lose sovereignty. No. If this is the form in which you want us to work, then no.

[Question] Mr President, do you believe that the arguments exchanged about arrogance are contributing to the peace process?

[As-Sadat] Well, Prime Minister Menahem Begin used a harsher language than this.

Report on Vance Departure

NC201504Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 1500 GMT 20 Jan 78 NC

[Text] Cairo, 20 January--U.S. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance left Cairo at 1545 today after a brief visit to Cairo lasting several hours, during which he held talks with President as-Sadat. He was seen off at the airport by Egyptian Foreign Minister Muhammad Ibrahim Kamil.

AL-AHRAM on Talks

LD210050Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 2253 GMT 20 Jan 78 LD

[Text] Cairo, 20 January--AL-AHRAM reports in tomorrow's issue that President Anwar as-Sadat told U.S. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance during their meeting that Egypt's insistence on a declaration of peace principles does not merely mean reaching formulas for these principles without Israel indicating a real desire for a peace that will be applied in practice, and that the objective is not to reach agreement on a set of principles at a time when Israel is declaring its insistence on clinging to land, building settlements, and refusing the Palestinian people's right to self-determination.

President as-Sadat told Cyrus Vance that President Carter proposed a declaration of peace principles as a basic step in implementing these principles and that Egypt welcomed this stand, but found that the Israeli attitude rejects the declaration of principles and, furthermore, the Israeli prime minister declared that he rejects withdrawal and refuses to recognize the Palestinian people's rights and their right to self-determination.

The paper says that Cyrus Vance returned to Cairo with seven points for a declaration of principles for which a draft had been drawn up. Israel approved some of these points but rejected two of them. Cyrus Vance heard President as-Sadat's remarks and reply to the U.S. plan. Egypt also informed Vance of the Egyptian working paper that includes the principles and affirmed that its interest is now centered on Israel showing a willingness to implement the principles.

AL-AHRAM says that during the talks between President as-Sadat and Cyrus Vance today the U.S. secretary of state presented to As-Sadat several alternatives involving future action if agreement is reached and if no progress is made. He stressed that the United States will continue its efforts until the required progress is achieved and in the manner President Carter promised President as-Sadat.

The paper said that Assistant Secretary of State Alfred Atherton will shuttle between Jerusalem and Cairo to continue these contacts.

GHALI NOTES IMPORTANCE OF SELF-DETERMINATION FOR PALESTINIANS

NC221510Y Paris AFP in English 1300 GMT 22 Jan 78 NC

[By Daniele Eyquem]

[Text] Cairo, Jan 22 (AFP)--Egyptian Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Butrus Ghali said today there could be no real negotiations between Israel and Egypt unless [words indistinct] recognized the possibility of self-determination for Palestinians. This recognition could not be a "precondition" but it was "a basic principle admitted by the international community and without which no peace is possible," Mr Ghali told AFP.

"At a time when independence has been granted to Djibouti and to the Comores, attempts are made to refuse to grant independence to Palestine, which is the cradle of one of the most sophisticated people in the Middle East. This is an aberration," said Mr Ghali, who, as a former foreign minister, accompanied President as-Sadat on his historic break-through trip to Jerusalem in November.

The Egyptian leader had made the trip to Jerusalem "mainly to obtain something for the Palestinians." Mr Ghali stressed the need for the existence of a Palestinian state. Without it, he said, "the number of extremists in the Palestinian ranks would grow."

The Egyptian minister said he was surprised the Israelis refused to accept "the Palestinian fact." The "limited autonomy" formula proposed by Mr Begin was intended to deceive U.S. public opinion and "showed a colonial spirit where relations with the Arabs are conceived as in the time of Lawrence of Arabia," he added.

He disagreed with Israeli propaganda which foresaw a future Palestine state as a satellite of the Soviet Union. "A Palestinian state will have to take the reality and politics of other countries of the region into account. They have no wish to be vassalised by Moscow and practice a policy of non-alignment," he said. According to Mr Ghali, the Palestine Liberation Organization has never been communist and is simply a movement of national liberation with no links to Marxism.

"It is not possible, in 1978, to decide that only one people in the world does not have the right to self-determination, while calling for only 20 percent of the former British mandated territory of Palestine for it," the Egyptian minister said. Mr Ghali expressed the hope that U.S. good offices would enable peace talks to get under way again. "The will to peace exists on both sides," he stressed.

Mr Ghali said that President as-Sadat, who spoke before parliament yesterday, was ready to accept several temporary proposals to ensure Israel's security after the Jewish state evacuated its forces from the occupied territories on the West Bank and in Gaza. United Nations troops could take over when the Israelis left, he suggested. In the meantime, a quadripartite commission, made up of Egyptian, Jordanian, Israeli and Palestinian representatives could examine details on applying the right of Palestinian self-determination before a referendum was organized.

GHALI: ISRAEL CANNOT HAVE BOTH TERRITORY, PEACE

LD231455Y Paris LE MONDE in French 21 Jan 78 pp 1,3 LD

[Jean-Pierre Peroncel Hugoz undated Cairo interview with Egyptian Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Butrus Ghali: "The Israelis Have Not Responded to As-Sadat's Act of Faith"]

[Text] [Question] Mr Minister of State, have the negotiations been broken off or suspended?

[Answer] For the time being they have been suspended. As Cyrus Vance said, there are ups and downs in all negotiations.

[Question] Why this suspension?

[Answer] The public statements by Mr Begin and Mr Dayan were the straw which broke the camel's back. By presenting their policy in this way they made it futile to continue negotiations. But the crux of the matter is the Israelis' rejection of the Palestinian reality; they seem more inclined to recognize the Egyptian reality. They think that a dialog with us will relieve them of the necessity of establishing contact with the Palestinians. So there would be no doubt about their rejection of Palestinian existence, they sent childish anti-Palestinian propaganda to our offices in Jerusalem.

(At this point, the secretary of state showed us a brochure which warned, in letters of blood on a black background, that "a PLO-state (would be) a mortal danger (for Israel)." The text intended to demonstrate that the PLO would create a pro-Soviet, anti-Israeli state on the West Bank.)

[Question] The main obstacle between you was therefore the Palestinian problem?

[Answer] There was also the actual dispute between Egypt and Israel, but we sensed that they were somewhat less obdurate over this at least. The fact remains that President as-Sadat's decision to go to Jerusalem has met with no real response from Israel's leaders to date. The act of faith in the Israelis which our president made has not been followed by the act of faith in the Egyptians, the Palestinians and the Arabs which we were entitled to expect from them. President as-Sadat went to Jerusalem for the Egyptians' sake as much as for the Palestinians' sake.

[Question] But Egypt was not given a mandate by the Palestinians to speak on their behalf, was it?

[Answer] There was no question of going into details on the Palestinians' behalf. But even without a written mandate we have a moral obligation toward the Arabs as a whole and toward the great principles recognized at the Arab summits. We have played a leading role in this part of the world for 7,000 years and we are not going to abdicate it now. As you can see, this is a far cry from the separate peace which some strategists still accuse us of wanting to conclude with Israel. It has been our constant concern to extract an Israeli declaration which would make it possible to bring the Palestinians and the other Arabs to the negotiating table.

[Question] But which Palestinians?

[Answer] That is another stage. But there are many moderate Palestinians, even within the PLO.

[Question] In your opinion, is the Israeli Government capable of carrying out the psychological transformation necessary for recognition of Palestinian existence?

[Answer] As far as Mr Begin is concerned, the Palestinians are a minority in Israel, like the Basques in Europe. In Mr Dayan's colonial, paternalist view, they are "natives." Israel in fact refuses to recognize the other person, or rather, the legitimate desire of the other person, the Palestinian, to have an entity of his own. And yet there can be no progress in the peace process until the need to allow this entity to be created is recognized by Israel. At present we are faced with an Israeli refusal which applies mainly to the Palestinian entity. International public opinion can no longer remain unaware that alongside the rejection by certain Arab states lies the rejection by the Israeli establishment. The latter is still entrenched in its old concepts, and those of its members who acknowledge unofficially that this attitude must evolve ask for time so that their compatriots can carry out the necessary cultural revolution with regard to the Arabs in general and the Palestinians in particular.

[Question] Yet it is said that Mr Begin is in a hurry to negotiate so that he can offer his country peace on the 30th anniversary of the foundation of the Hebrew state, which falls this year.

[Answer] One sometimes has the impression that the Israelis want peace very quickly, so much so that they curse 24 hours' delay, and that they are afraid that the "narrow door" opened will close again. But, paradoxically, they ask for time to adjust to what some Israeli leaders call the "post-As-Sadat trip" period.

[Question] Are they not also obsessed with security?

[Answer] This is a very real obsession, but it also conceals expansionist ambitions. Then again, Israel claims territories sometimes in the name of security, sometimes in the name of the Bible. The Israeli Government is torn between the desire for peace and the desire to keep these territories, but it knows that it cannot have both. It has not yet managed to make a choice.

[Question] The Israelis' military superiority perhaps gives them time to think.

[Answer] Let us discuss instead their weaknesses in relation to the Arab world, weaknesses of which they are becoming increasingly aware. Quite simply, I believe that they have not yet carried out the psychological revolution which would enable them to imagine their country in a universe of peace. Nor have they realized what a moderating role Egypt, once freed from the Israeli burden, could play in the African and Arab worlds as a whole. When the Israeli Government's deputy prime minister Mr Yadin said to me: "Let us accustom ourselves to the shock created by As-Sadat's visit to our country," I replied: "Be careful, as in the Greek tragedies, there may be an 'accident' which would force us to go back to the beginning again.

AS-SADAT MEETING WITH EGYPTIAN OFFICIALS REPORTED

Receives Mubarak, Kamil

NC231641Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 1632 GMT 23 Jan 78 NC

[Text] Cairo, 23 January--President Muhammad Anwar as-Sadat today received Vice President Husni Mubarak and Foreign Minister Muhammad Ibrahim Kamil.

Meets With Mubarak, At-Tuhami

NC231642Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 1633 GMT 23 Jan 78 NC

[Text] Cairo, 23 January--President Muhammad Anwar as-Sadat today received Vice President Husni Mubarak and Deputy Prime Minister at the President's Office Lt Gen Hasan at-Tuhami.

FOREIGN MINISTER TO REPORT TO ASSEMBLY COMMITTEES

NC232048Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 2034 GMT 23 Jan 78 NC

[Text] Cairo, 23 January--At the end of this week Foreign Minister Muhammad Ibrahim Kamil will make an important statement to the National Security, Arab Affairs, and Foreign Relations committees of the People's Assembly. The foreign minister will explain the latest developments in the wake of the suspension of the talks of the Political and Military committees and the future moves.

UN DELEGATE AL-MAJID LEAVES FOR WASHINGTON 24 JAN

NC241039Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 1010 GMT 24 Jan 78 NC

[Text] Cairo, 24 January--Dr 'Ismat 'Abd al-Majid, Egyptian permanent delegate to the United Nations left Cairo for Washington this morning to resume his duty at the United Nations.

Dr 'Ismat 'Abd al-Majid will make preparations and pave the way for the visit to the United States of the Egyptian parliamentary mission led by Speaker of the People's Assembly Engineer Sayyid Mari'i.

LIBYAN INTELLIGENCE AGENT REPORTED EXECUTED 24 JAN

NC2411022 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1044 GMT 24 Jan 78 NC

[Excerpt] Alexandria, 24 January--Libyan intelligence agent Naji Sulayman al-Mansuri, who was entrusted by Libyan intelligence to plant an explosive charge in a room of the (Maurice) Hotel in At-Tahrir square in Alexandria and in the Wadi an-Nil Hotel near the railraod station, was executed this morning.

The explosives killed Ramadan Misbah, 'Abd al-Basit Muhammad and 'Abdallah Raghib Muhammad and wounded eight others. The Alexandria Supreme State Security Court sentenced the accused to death at its sesson on 28 May. The sentence was approved by the president of the republic.

YAR FOREIGN MINISTER AL-ASNAJ ARRIVES IN CAIRO 23 JAN

NC2314202 Cairo Domestic Service in Arabic 1230 GMT 23 Jan 78 NC

[Text] YAR Foreign Minister 'Abdallah al-Asnaj arrived in Cairo at noon today for a 1-day visit to Egypt. He was welcomed by Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Dr Butrus Ghali.

'Abdallah al-Asnaj said on arrival that he was carrying a letter from Yemeni Command Council Chairman Ahmad al-Ghasmi to Presidnet Anwar as-Sadat concerning Egyptian-Yemeni relations and inter-Arab relations in general. He added that the YAR is following with interest the Egyptian initiatives which sought and are seeking the welfare of Egypt and the Arab nation. He expressed Yemen's support for these initiatives. He said: Israel has revealed its true intentions and it bears the responsibility for its stand because the As-Sadat initiative was and will remain a peace initiative.

The Yemeni foreign minister went on: What we need are more efforts and a greater spirit of Arab solidarity. The wisdom of the Arab kings and presidents will overcome the [word indistrinct] conditions. Yemen's aim is to insure their meeting in an atmosphere of amity to consider the present situation. He added that his present tour comes within this context.

Meets With Kamil

NC2320562 Cairo MENA in Arabic 2020 GMT 23 Jan 78 NC

[Text] Cairo, 23 January--Discussions were held this evening between Egyptian Foreign Minister Muhammad Ibrahim Kamil and YAR Foreign Minister 'Abdallah al-Asnaj.

The discussions, which lasted for (? 1 hour), dealt with the latest developments in the Middle East, the Arab situation, the situation in the Horn of Africa and bilateral relations between Egypt and the YAR. Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Dr Butrus Butrus Ghali and the YAR ambassador in Cairo, Hasan Yahya al-Sahuli, attended the meeting.

SUDANESE DEFENSE MINISTER CONCLUDES CAIRO VISIT

Meeting With Al-Jamasi

NC191618Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 1540 GMT 19 Jan 78 NC

[Text] Cairo, 19 January--Gen Muhammad 'Abd al-Ghani al-Jamasi, deputy prime minister and minister of war and war production, this afternoon received in his office Gen Bashir Muhammad 'Ali, the Sudanese defense minister. The meeting, which lasted an hour, dealt with military subjects of interest to both the Arab Republic of Egypt and Sudan. The Sudanese defense minister arrived in Cairo from Geneva yesterday for a short visit to Egypt.

Departure for Khartoum

NC212024Y Cairo Domestic Service in Arabic 1833 GMT 21 Jan 78 NC

[Text] Sudanese Defense Minister Lt Gen Bashir Muhammad 'Ali left Cairo for Khartoum this evening after holding discussions on some bilateral military subjects between the Arab Republic of Egypt and the Democratic Republic of the Sudan.

AL-AHRAM: EGYPT OPPOSES U.S. SALE OF F-16'S TO ISRAEL

LD202330Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 2300 GMT 20 Jan 78 LD

[Text] Cairo, 20 January--AL-AHRAM says that Egypt has made known its views regarding the new aircraft deal which the United States has concluded with Israel. The aircraft are of the F-16 type. AL-AHRAM says in tomorrow's issue that Egypt has made it clear that the continuing military support for Israel will not help the situation or the peace efforts.

AL-AKHBAR: SOVIETS MAY STEP IN IF PEACE TALKS FAIL

NC211150Y Paris AFP in English 1119 GMT 21 Jan 78 NC

[Text] Cairo, Jan 21, (AFP)--The failure of Israeli-Egyptian peace negotiations would bring Soviet influence back to Egypt and keep Arab dictators in power, the Cairo daily AL-AKHBAR warned today.

Israeli Prime Minister Menahem Begin will have been responsible "for bringing Soviet influence back into this area through his obstinate wish to keep a few cabins in the desert inhabited by 4,000 Jews," said a leading article by AL-AKHBAR's editor Mustafa Amin. He appealed to the Israeli people to keep Mr Begin from leading Israel to its doom. If Israel failed to make peace, the Arabs would soon be "able to buy twice as many weapons as are supplied to Israel by the United States."

AL-AKHBAR RESPONDS TO KOSYGIN STATEMENT ON EGYPT

LD202342Y Cairo AL-AKHBAR in Arabic 17 Jan 78 p 6 LD

[Ahmad Zayn article: "Soviet Insults"]

[Excerpts] A few days ago Kosygin suddenly came out and spoke openly about Egypt and its president. It is as if Egypt is a village or a farm that belongs to the Soviet Union. He made this statement during Boumediene's visit to Moscow after his tour of the Arab east and west in order to whip up hatred among the Arabs and arouse the countries of the world against Egypt. It is as if he wants to solve the Sahara problem, where he was bitterly defeated, through fighting against Cairo.

Boumediene, who has given the United States control of his economy and his gas and oilfields and maintained his loyalty to the United States, is now posing as a socialist hero in the hope of exploiting the present situation and obtaining something from Moscow that would strengthen his position in the Maghreb. He is a man who wants war among the Arabs in order to serve his selfish interests. He agrees with the Soviet Union on this point. The Soviet Union wants to once again divide the Arab countries into progressives and reactionaries and to promote disputes and wars between them because this is the only way it can maintain its influence in the area. The Soviet Union wants to exploit the wealth of these countries in return for scraps of arms. Indeed, the Soviet Union has begun to feel that the profits it is raking from Libya, Iraq and Algeria are little and has, therefore, begun grabbing for the Arab petroleum areas by intervening in the struggle between Ethiopia and Sudan in order to get a foothold in the Red Sea. From there, it would extend its activities to the Arabian Peninsula in the hope that one of its agents will take over power in one of the Arab oil states.

The Soviet Union realizes that as long as there is a strong nationalist government in Egypt it will be unable to play its game in the Middle East and the Arab oil states. It also realizes that an end to the Arab-Israeli conflict and the establishment of peace in the area will cause it severe damage because it will lose its position in the whole area. The Soviet Union has established its position and influence in the area because of its role as arms provider and as long as there are wars between one Arab country and another and between the Arab countries and Israel the Soviet Union's influence will remain strong and the need of the Arab countries for arms will increase. But if peace comes about, wars end, and Arab unity emerges, strong Soviet influence in the area will diminish and, indeed, come to an end.

For this reason we were not surprised by Kosygin's statements. All that he said about Egypt seeking a separate peace and thereby deepening Arab division as well as the rest of his statement is not worth the paper it was written on. It only reflects strong anger because of the Soviet Union's failure in the Middle East after it had been expelled from Egypt and later from Somalia and the subsequent diminishing of its influence in other Arab countries. All that is now left for the Soviet Union is a handful of rulers who rule with terror and remain in power through killing and torture.

We must expect that the more Egypt succeeds, the stronger it becomes, the more democracy and freedom prevail there, and the more its international position is ehnanced the angrier the Soviet Union becomes and the greater its fear for its agents in their shaky positions will increase.

Therefore, the more strident the Soviet Union's attack on us becomes and the more it resorts to shouting and using unseemly language, we will realize that our policy is successful, that our blows are strong, and that our status in the world is being further enhanced. Therefore, we must not be aroused by such insults. Rather, they are the yardstick of our success or failure in our battle for the unity of the Arab nation and for the sake of peace. It is these very characteristics that will completely destroy Soviet influence and destroy its ambitions.

AS-SADAT THANKS KING HASSAN FOR MOROCCAN SUPPORT

LD212106Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 1647 GMT 21 Jan 78 LD

[Excerpts] Cairo, 21 January--In a message he sent to King Hassan II of Morocco today, President as-Sadat praised the splendid nationalist stand of the Moroccan monarch in his support for Egypt in its fateful struggle and for the sake of right, justice and dignity.

The text of President as-Sadat's message to King Hassan II follows:

Your Majesty dear brother King Hassan II, I have received your kind message with appreciation and gratitude and Iwould like to express to you my pride and the Egyptian people's pride in your splendid nationalist stand on Egypt's side in its fateful struggle for the sake of right, justice and dignity.

As you know, I have taken my initiative out of the firm belief that the supreme strategic objective of our nation is to achieve a just and honorable peace in which we will regain our occupied territories and restore our usurped right so that under such peace our nation will continue its historical and constructive march and will fulfill its humanitarian mission at the forefront of nations and peoples.

You know, dear brother, that I have made this historical visit from a position of strength and not out of a sense of weakness. I faced Israel with the peaceful challenge after we had triumphed against it in the battlefield. In both confrontations we relied on our strong political, legal and moral position. We believe without fanaticism or arrogance that right is on our side because we do not want aggression, nor do we intend to harm anyone. Rather we are seeking to fulfill a demand that is based on legality and enjoys the support of the whole world.

I have felt and still feel the burden of responsibility that we are shouldering in regaining the occupied Arab territories and restoring the rights of our brethren who are still under the yoke of occupation and putting and end to Israeli expansion which is gravely threatening the Arab land and its legitimate owners, expansion over which one cannot remain silent and which would lead to the most serious consequences if allowed to spread to the rest of the Arab entity.

In our sincere quest for peace we neither bargain nor forsake anything because peace can only be based on justice and right. Indeed we consider that bargaining and indulging in excuses in order to avoid adopting a stand compatible with justice is a form of behavior which only ignoble people resort to, people who are unable to reach any level of responsibility and who have failed to absorb the lessons of history.

If arrogance and self-delusion have blinded the Israeli rulers from seeing the realities of the situation and realizing its dimensions and prevented them from rising to the level of the initiative, they alone will be responsible for what might result from this intransigent attitude before the world and before all the peace-loving peoples. They must reconsider their attitude and open their eyes before it is too late, for they have wasted much time and given the world a negative impression about their intentions.

I have no doubt that your sincere support for Egypt and its people in its rejection of this intransigent Israeli behavioris a logical sequel to your stand on our side in our sincere call for peace, because whoever really cares for peace and works for its attainment abhors seeing peace being tampered with or used as a commodity for bargaining.

As you would expect, we are marching along the path of right and justice, the path through which we seek to please God and pursue the welfare of our glorious nation.

The life of the honorable prophet is our best example; he is our example in his heroic insistence of struggle for the sake of God and for striving by every means to achieve good and justice. May God give victory to whoever supports him.

AL-AKHBAR: U.S. MUST DEFINE ITS POSITION TOWARD PEACE

NC220708Y Cairo Domestic Service in Arabic 0600 GMT 22 Jan 78 NC

[From the press review]

[Excerpts] In an article entitled "What Does Washington Say?" the chief editor of AL-AKHBAR, Musa Sabri, deals with one aspect of President as-Sadat's speech, the part on what the U.S. position should be toward the establishment of peace.

The writer notes the positive nature of the efforts exerted by U.S. diplomacy, but expresses some reservations. He says that despite this great joint Egyptian-U.S. effort we have arrived at a number of results which we must clarify in our minds before deciding on the next moves. First, it has become clear that the Begin government wants to waste time in the hope that the overwhelming world support for the Egyptian initiative will weaken. Second, it has become clear that the Begin government is abandoning the firm principles without which no peace can be established if Israel does not abide by them. Third, it has become clear that the direct negotiations are revolving in a vicious circle without a definite U.S. position vis-a-vis all the essential bases.

The writer expresses the belief that the issue now is not one of U.S. pressure and not one of a repeated Israeli declaration, because Israel will not accept pressure. The issue today, as President as-Sadat has said, is that Israel is adopting an intransigent position and is dealing with the historic initiative with its same old unchanged method. In doing so, Israel is depending on two important elements: Jewish influence on U.S. decision-making institutions, and the huge weapons arsenal which the United States has supplied to Israel.

Consequently, the writer expresses the opinion that what is required now of the United States is to define the just principles on the basis of which the whole world can give its judgement in our favor or against us. The existence of some negative Arab positions is no excuse for the United States not to define its position.

The writer affirms that the direction of all the current trends demands that the United States define its position in a manner that would effectively assist in the establishment of peace and in depriving the Israeli negotiator of the methods of maneuvers and wasting time.

The United States is fulfilling a positive role which is totally different from the subversive role of the Soviet Union. This is clear. Therefore, an attempt by the United States to define its position on the essential principles of peace will not allow Soviet subversion to take effect, and will not allow the element of time to work against the success of the establishment of peace.

GHALI, CUBAN AMBASSADOR DISCUSS BILATERAL RELATIONS

NC221211Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 1154 GMT 22 Jan 78 NC

[Text] Cairo, 22 January--Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Dr Butrus Ghali today received Cuban Ambassador in Cairo Domingo Garcia Rodriguez. They discussed international issues of interest to the two countries, particularly in the African Continent, and bilateral relations between Egypt and Cuba.

ITALIAN COMMUNIST PARTY DELEGATION ARRIVES IN BAGHDAD

JN231517Y Baghdad INA in Arabic 1450 GMT 23 Jan 78 JN

[Text] Baghdad, 23 January--Giancarlo Pajetta, member of the Secretariat of the Italian Communist Party [PCI] and head of the Foreign Relations Office, arrived here today for a 2-day visit to Iraq at the invitation of the Ba'th Party National Command.

In a statement to INA, Pajetta asserted his party's support for the struggle being waged by the Palestinian people for the sake of regaining their full rights. He described the relations between the Ba'th Party and the PCI as brotherly and strong.

He was received by Dr Munif ar-Razzaz, Ba'th Party assistant secretary general; Comrade Zuhayr al-Qadiri, director of the Foreign Relations Office in the National Command; and the Italian ambassador in Baghdad.

OMANI INTERIOR MINISTER ARRIVES FOR 3-DAY VISIT

JN241106Y Baghdad INA in Arabic 1050 GMT 24 Jan 78 JN

[Text] Baghdad, 24 January--Omani Interior Minister Muhammad ibn Ahmad arrived here today at the head of a delegation for a 3-day visit to Iraq. The Omani minister said his visit is aimed at strengthening relations between the two fraternal countries.

TRADE MINISTER MEETS WITH ENVOYS TO ARAB COUNTRIES

JN231520Y Baghdad INA in Arabic 1500 GMT 23 Jan 78 JN

[Text] Baghdad, 23 January--RCC member and Trade Minister Hasan 'Ali has affirmed that Iraq pays special attention to developing its economic and trade relations with the Arab countries.

At a meeting held here today with Iraq's ambassadors to the Arab countries, Hasan 'Ali said that Iraq has made serious strides toward deepening and developing its economic and trade relations with the Arab countries by means of economic and trade agreements, joint projects, trade centers and trade exhibitions.

Hasan 'Ali reviewed Iraq's economic relations with the developing countries. He said: Our relations with these countries have advanced considerably, compatible with the unity of interests and objectives.

Hasan 'Ali also explained that Iraq's relations with the socialist countries now occupy an important position and that cooperation with these countries has special significance for development in Iraq.

It will be recalled that Iraq's ambassadors to the Arab countries are currently convening in Baghdad as part of a series of conferences being held by the Foreign Ministry with Iraqi ambassadors abroad.

OIL DELEGATION LEAVES FOR MEETING IN NEW DELHI

JN230838Y Baghdad INA in Arabic 0830 GMT 23 Jan 78 JN

[Text] Baghdad, 23 January--A delegation of the Iraqi national oil company, headed by 'Ali Hadi al-Jabir, the vice chairman of the company, today left for New Delhi for a visit of several days to India. The delegation will discuss with Indian oil officials cooperation between the two countries in the domain of oil, oil extraction and oil refining.

KING HUSAYN INTERVIEWED ON PALESTINIAN PROBLEM

LD240001Y London BBC Domestic Television Service in English 2010 GMT 23 Jan 78 LD

[Interview with King Husayn by BBC correspondent (Richard Lindee) on 21 January and carried on the "Panorama" program presented by Charles Wheeler--recorded]

[Text] [Charles Wheeler] Nine weeks ago "Panorama" reported from Jerusalem of the euphoria touched off by President as-Sadat's decision to journey to the heart of enemy territory in search of peace. Today the atmosphere has soured. Last week, in the wake of the speech by Prime Minister Begin saying that Israel will not withdraw from all the Arab territories she occupies, Egypt's foreign minister abandoned the talks and flew home to Cairo. On Saturday President as-Sadat told the Egyptian parliament that Israel must make that total withdrawal. He asked for arms from America. Today Mr Begin repeated that Israel would not withdraw and accused the Egyptian newspaper AL-AKHBAR of anti-Semitism by describing him as Shylock; so the negotiations have run into the sand and the arguments of As-Sadat's Arab critics have been strengthened. One Arab country, though, finds itself torn; Jordan is sympathetic to As-Sadat's initiative but is deeply worried that the Egyptian president is destroying Arab unity. (Richard Lindee) has been talking to King Husayn who is now--after 25 years on the throne--the elder statesman of the Arab confrontation states.

[Question] In making this formal demand--as he calls it--to the United States for the same kind of sophisticated arms as the states gives to Israel, what do you think President as-Sadat is really trying to do? Is he now beating the plowshares back into swords?

[Answer] I don't think so. I think that the irony of it is that this Arab nation, as rich as it may be, has one weakness in its position right now, and that weakness is the military weakness--the fact that it did not build its strength over the many years that have passed up to a point of parity with Israel. I think if we had achieved that, maybe we would have been closer to peace, because the alternate solution to a peaceful solution would be an immediate eruption in the area. Now, unfortunately, the Israelis feel that they are extremely strong and this probably contributes considerably to their arrogance and intransigence.

[Question] Is war an option for the Arabs any more, do you think?

[Answer] I think it can be in the long run, but I really hope and pray that it isn't--not for us, not for the Israelis, not for this area and not for the world.

[(Lindee)] On Saturday King Husayn told me he was worrying that President as-Sadat might just give up and announce his resignation. So the king is now equally relieved that the negotiations have been interrupted rather than abandoned and that As-Sadat has made no unilateral concession that would further divide Arab opinion. And whatever Husayn may have felt about As-Sadat's going-it-alone diplomacy he is very conscious that if there is a chance that peace could still result from the president's unorthodox initiative, then of all the confrontation states, Jordan might benefit the most. Thirty years ago it was Jordan's Arab legion that led the battle by the Arab states against the foundation of Israel. Palestinian Arabs who fled from the fighting faced either exile or life in refugee camps under Jordanian administration, for Jordan had occupied the West Bank and half of Jerusalem. For the Palestinians, Jordanian rule was a poor substitute for independence. And when King Abdullah held secret talks with Israelis, he was assassinated--shot by a Palestinian while at prayer in Al-Aqsa Mosque in Jerusalem with his grandson, the present King Husayn, at his side.

In the 6-day war of 1967, Husayn lost all the West Bank territory his grandfather had gained for the kingdom. The refugees fled eastward again, across the river and into Jordan itself. Husayn had to grapple with the resentment of his own people--now outnumbered in their country by the Palestinian refugees--and also with the raging frustrations of the exiles. By now the refugees had given up hope that King Husayn would ever recover their land; they turned instead to the Palestine Liberation Organization which thrived on the humiliation of life in the camps. When the power of the PLO threatened to destroy Husayn's rule, the king declared war on the guerrillas. In the black September of 1970, Husayn drove them out, denying them the bases from which they'd launched guerrilla raids into Israeli-held territory. To many Palestinians Husayn was now a traitor hated even more than Israeli leaders. When in the October war of 1973 Husayn sent his tanks to the Syrian front and made no direct attempt to regain the West Bank, Palestinians became even more determined to liberate themselves. And so, at an Arab summit in 1974, Yasir 'Arafat's PLO was recognized as representing the people of Palestine and not King Husayn. Husayn has had to accept that decision--however much he may have privately resented it. But of course the PLO has been no more successful in liberating the West Bank, Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip than he was. So Husayn thinks there is still a good chance that, given the possibility of self-determination, the Palestinians of the occupied territories would turn to him to lead them. This, of course, Husayn only hints at. He certainly hasn't found it helpful that, under the new Israeli plan, Palestinians would have to become either Israeli or Jordanian citizens. And whatever Husayn is hopeful of, he's not hopeful of peace. This weekend, at his seaside villa at Aqaba--only a stone's throw from the Israeli resort of Eilat--the king talked in a fundamentally pessimistic way about the prospects for a settlement.

[Question] Your Majesty, as President as-Sadat's peace initiative seems to falter, perhaps even to fail, I think many people might say to you: Where are you, why haven't you given him your wholehearted support?

[Answer] But I have. I did not give him my support from the word go because I was caught by surprise in terms of the initiative he took and on the other hand I tried my very best--as when in the period that followed--to deal with matters in a logical manner, to avoid overreacting emotionally to what was happening in this part of the world. I tried my best to help with the rest of the Arab world, to try to bring it together. But I have made it very clear from the beginning that President as-Sadat's initiative was a very brave, courageous one.

[Question] I think many people feel that this peace initiative might have got rather further and not got bogged down in the Middle East sands if it had been a four-wheel drive vehicle rather than a two-wheel, if you and the other confrontation states had joined President as-Sadat perhaps even in going to Jerusalem?

[Answer] I doubt that it would have been more useful and I don't think that even President as-Sadat himself expected us to move any faster than we did. After all, what we are after was a comprehensive settlement and to bring all the parties together to the conference table at the right time, under the right conditions. When this was our objective there was no point in just reacting to As Sadat's initiative by going along to join him--to join him to do what precisely?

[Question] Well, could you have stood in Jerusalem and said, as President as-Sadat did to the Israelis: We welcome you to live among us in peace and security? Could you have done that?

[Answer] As far as I am concerned, since '67 onwards I have done just that through very many channels as were made available to us.

[Question] It was the public way the president did it, of course, that made the impact, wasn't it?

[Answer] Yes, I suppose it was the public way in which he did it that made the impact, but we have tried our very best and we have made it very clear time and again: if Israel were willing to withdraw from all the territories occupied in June of '67 and recognize the rights of the Palestinians to self-determination, we ourselves would have been willing to go to any length, even by ourselves if need be. But unfortunately years passed and all our efforts failed.

[Question] You feel the Israelis have been intransigent.

[Answer] I don't only feel that they have been intransigent, I think that they are really impossible in terms of their attitude.

[Question] You don't believe they want to make peace?

[Answer] I believe the choice was always there and I said that at the United Nations in '67: territory or peace. Unfortunately, it appears territory much more than peace at this stage.

[Question] I should rather ask if though you believe that President as-Sadat has acted courageously, you think his initiative has done more harm than good to the Arab cause.

[Answer] No, no, I believe that--in a negative way, I suppose--it produced exactly what we needed for a very long period of time, and that was: Is there a chance? Were we living in dreams that a just and honorable peace could be a result of our toil in this area? Well, he went and he tried and beyond that I don't think that anybody could have done more for the cause of peace and if it fails it is not on our heads, on our shoulders in terms of the blame, but on Israel and Israel alone. It is sad; I don't know what the future will hold for all of us except disaster. President as-Sadat went on behalf of the Arab world, the Arab people, to Israel. He spoke of what the framework of peace should be, what it could be, in regard to the Arab view. He presented the offer, he made the challenge, he spoke for all of us. If he does not succeed, if his effort has failed, he has represented the Arab world and the Arab view and the Arab aspiration and feeling before the world--that's all. It's Israel that has to take the blame. I think that failure is going to mean many disasters in this area, maybe ones that will affect the world as a whole. But at least we are not living in the unknown any more. We know exactly what we are up against and, sad as it is, this has been the result.

[Question] You say the result may now be disastrous. Do you therefore regret that this initiative was begun in the first place.

[Answer] No, I think that for so many years--as far as I'm concerned--I've done so much, I've hoped so much; my whole inclination, my whole feeling has been for peace, for a better future for the generations to come. All my efforts, my dreams--they are shattered. Maybe this is a reality that one has to begin to live with somehow. Maybe it's better than just living in dreams.

[Question] You're saying you see no prospect of peace at all.

[Answer] Not unless there is a very basic change in the Israeli position and I can't see it happening. They unfortunately are still enslaved within that fortress mentality, relying on strength and power, and they can't seem to break out of it, and sadly enough even President as-Sadat's visit and effort did not succeed in producing the desired result.

[Question] You say that one reason you yourself would not go to Jerusalem is that you are no longer in the position to speak for the Palestinians on the West Bank; that is now not your job. Would you still like to do that?

[Answer] I would go to the end of the earth if it meant the return of the territory I was responsible for--not to me, but to be placed under international auspices and for the people--there and elsewhere to exercise their right to self-determination, decide what their future ought to be. I made that very clear time and again.

[Question] Some people have said that you are piqued at President as-Sadat's daring to spea on behalf of the Palestinians--the Palestinian issue on the West Bank--when you yourself are not able to do so.

[Answer] I am sorry but this really is ridiculous, and it's so far from the truth. I admire President as-Sadat and I respect what he did and I support him fully. And at this time I support him with all my strength, not only myself but this is the feeling of my government and people.

[Question] Do you have that feeling now, as you've had before, that some people feel that the way to deal with the Palestinian problem is to dispense with the Kingdom of Jordan?

[Answer] I don't know, but if it were just myself and my family, it would be a different matter. We are part of the Arab past, its present, its future, maybe. But this east bank is not a void. It has its people and they have their rights. And it is not a vacant lot for others to come and solve their problems at the expense of the east Jordanians.

[Question] So far, it seems to me, the Egyptians and the Israelis have done no more, really, than state their basic negotiating positions, so why are you so depressed?

[Answer] I'm so depressed because I think that it is fairly obvious that there isn't a leadership in Israel that has the moral courage to say or write: We will withdraw from the territories that we occupied in June of '67 against the establishment of peace, and try peace. I don't think that such a leadership does exist there; I believe they have still ambitions of settling in this area and expanding and denying others the rights they claim for themselves. And if this continues to happen, there is no hope.

[Question] Do you see yourself now becoming involved in these negotiations?

[Answer] I don't think that these negotiations are likely to continue, but if the negotiations led to the acceptance of the principles that would have meant that we moved to discuss details--the time plan, really; the plan as such was for meetings between Israel and Egypt, with the United States, to prepare the ground, to define the principles that would govern a solution.

And I understood that what was to follow was probably an Arab summit where President as-Sadat would be able to say: This is the basis for the solution; it is now the responsibility of each country to go and discuss what is their affair. But this never happened.

[Question] Do you see no way in which you can now intervene to preserve this initiative?

[Answer] I really don't know. I will be looking to see what could be done, but I doubt whether there is much that I can do. And if As-Sadat has failed, I doubt whether I'm going to succeed at all.

[Question] War has been tried, President as-Sadat's peace initiative has been tried. Where do we go from here?

[Answer] What I'm afraid of is that we reach the psychological moment I have dreaded--of losing all hope of ever achieving peace with Israel--and regardless of how long it will take before the next eruption, that we build and build for nothing except to survive further possible military actions by the Israelis, or for a time when we are strong enough to talk not only peace with no alternative but to have an alternative ready should that fail. I think that we are going to have to wait for the world to say what it feels, for maybe time to pass to the point where maybe some would be found in Israel who would be courageous enough to match what President as-Sadat had done at this stage and seeking peace--a just and honorable peace.

AMMAN RADIO DEFINES STAND ON CURRENT PEACE TALKS

JN182120Y Amman Domestic Service in Arabic 1615 GMT 18 Jan 78 JN

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] Jordan cannot bargain over the Palestinian territory and rights. If Jordan does participate in the negotiations to restore the land we lost in June 1967, all these territories and rights must be restored, but not to Jordan. They must be placed under international supervision until the Palestinian people determine their future in the occupied land.

With this complete clarity His Majesty King Husayn announced, on French television, Jordan's stand toward the Palestine issue at this serious stage the area is passing through. The area is now at a final and serious crossroads. If peace is not to be established on the basis of the principles of Resolutions 242 and 338, the results will affect the future of our area and the entire world.

Jordan, which is internationally empowered by Resolution 242 with the right to regain the occupied Palestinian territory, adheres more than ever before to the Palestinian people's right to determine their own national destiny by themselves and to choose the relations they want with their neighbors, in absolute freedom and without pressure or compulsion by any other party in the world. Thus this wise pan-Arab stand is not and cannot be opposed to the requirements of establishing peace or to the aspirations of the Palestinian Arab people. For this reason all efforts must be focused on enabling the Palestinian people to regain their land and rights, particularly their right to determine their future by themselves.

Israel, at the Political Committee meetings in occupied Jerusalem, still insists on the names it has given to the occupied West Bank. Thus we do not believe that it will adopt a more flexible stand toward the substance of the issue, that is, Israel's withdrawal from the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, the return of Arab sovereignty to occupied Arab Jerusalem and recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

The reciprocal concessions which Israeli Foreign Minister Moshe Dayan made yesterday, after two meetings of the Political Committee, clearly indicate Israel's insistence on adhering to its well-known stands, particularly toward the Palestine issue.

If it is feasible to consider the issue of adjustments to the borders with an open mind, then that open mind must apply to all parties to the conflict, particularly the Israeli side. The Palestine issue must not be divided, underrated or denied absolutely, as happened in the declaration of Israel's intention following the Ismailia meeting. Also the expansionist settlement plans must not be described as part of the peace process.

Thus His Majesty King Husayn believes that the situation requires a frank declaration and a clear stand which does not tolerate bargaining. Jordan cannot bargain over Palestinian rights and territory. This principled stand must be clear to all parties, particularly as the declaration of intentions and principles on which the parties will proceed to peace is to be announced at this stage.

If the statement includes Israel's approval of the two basic principles provided for in UN Resolution 242, namely, withdrawal from all occupied Arab territory and recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, the countries of the area will enjoy real peace for the first time and the world community will be relieved of a thorny and serious problem that has threatened its peace and security for the past 30 years.

AD-DUSTUR COMMENTS ON BEGIN KNESSET SPEECH

JN240749Y Amman Domestic Service in Arabic 0515 GMT 24 Jan 78 JN

[From the press review]

[Text] Under the headline "Begin Faces the Dilemma of Peace," the newspaper AD-DUSTUR says: Begin yesterday administered a deadly blow to whatever chance remained for resuming the talks between Egypt and Israel on the political and military levels. He declared before the Knesset his determination not to withdraw from all the occupied Arab territories and to maintain the Israeli settlements in Sinai.

It seems that Begin was not satisfied with the door which has been left open by President as-Sadat. He preferred to hasten to close that door in a way far removed from any sense of responsibility or etiquette.

Nothing proves this more than the fact that the Israeli prime minister spoke slanderously against President as-Sadat. Begin said that the Egyptian president knew before coming to Jerusalem that Israel would not withdraw from all the occupied Arab territories and would not abandon the settlements in Sinai. It was as if Begin wanted to say that since President as-Sadat knew this stand, why did he go to Jerusalem?

QATARI FOREIGN MINISTER ARRIVES IN AMMAN

JN231930Y Amman Domestic Service in Arabic 1900 GMT 23 Jan 78 JN

[Text] Shaykh Suhaym ibn Hamad Al Thani, minister of foreign affairs in fraternal Qatar, arrived in Amman this evening. The guest minister was received upon arrival by His Highness Prince Ra'd ibn Zayd, chief chamberlain; Hasan Ibrahim, minister of state for foreign affairs; the Qatari ambassador in Amman; and the members of the embassy.

FOREIGN MINISTER CALLS FOR ISOLATION OF EGYPT

JN240720Y Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 0415 GMT 24 Jan 78 JN

[Text] Damascus--Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister 'Abd al-Halim Khaddam has declared that the decision on war and peace, throughout ancient and contemporary history, has never been Egyptian.

He said that the quitting of a front or the fall of a government or a state into a swamp does not at all mean the collapse of the aims of such a government or state. It is therefore natural for us to begin arranging new positions with a view to restoring the strategic balance between us and the Zionist enemy which will enable us to resume the struggle until the aims of our nation are achieved.

This was stated in the course of a political lecture 'Abd al-Halim Khaddam delivered at the engineering college auditorium at the invitation of the Ba'th Party command branch at Damascus University as part of a series of political meetings the branch has been holding with members of the teaching staff and students of the university since the beginning of the scholastic year.

Comrade Salim Shayya, the secretary of the party branch at Damascus University, the members of the branch command, the president of Damascus University, the members of the executive and administrative bureau of the National Union of Syrian Students, the members of the teaching staff at Damascus University and many students of the university attended the lecture.

Khaddam also said: That is why Syria's policy now aims to achieve the following:

1. To increase the effectiveness of Syria's own strength and strengthen our armed forces.

2. To set up an Arab front which will be a basis for the continuity of our pan-Arab struggle.

3. To isolate and blockade the Egyptian regime and to deprive it of Arab support as much as we can.

Khaddam added: Our own resources and those of the Arab nation will undoubtedly suffice to enable us to rectify the situation and to resume the struggle to achieve the aims of the Arab nation.

CABINET HEARS REVIEW OF MIDEAST DEVELOPMENTS BY KHULAYFAWI

JN240628Y Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 0415 GMT 24 Jan 78 JN

[Text] Damascus--The cabinet held a meeting at 1700 yesterday under Prime Minister Maj Gen 'Abd ar-Rahman Khulayfawi.

The cabinet listened to a review by the deputy prime minister and foreign minister on the latest developments in the political situation in the area. The cabinet then began studying the agenda. It considered bills submitted by the ministries of health, communications, local administration, justice, and finance.

The cabinet concluded its meeting at 2200.

FRONT ISSUES STATEMENT SUPPORTING AL-ASAD'S NOMINATION

JN2320117 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 1615 GMT 23 Jan 78 JN

[Excerpts] The Central Command of the progressive National Front has issued the following statement on the occasion of the plebiscite for the president in the Syrian Arab Republic:

Brother compatriots: At its historic session yesterday, the People's Assembly decided to nominate leader President Hafiz al-Asad for the post of president for the coming constitutional term.

The statement says: The plebiscite on the presidency of Syria during the next few days will define the Syrian people's position toward the basic issues that are being directly and urgently submitted on the national, Arab and international arenas. This means:

1. To define the position toward the vicious imperialist-Zionist onslaught against the Arab presence now and in the future, against the culture and values of our pan-Arab history, against the right of our nation to freedom and progress and the right to establish its pan-Arab unity in a single Arab state.

2. To define the position toward the Zionist-imperialist solutions being submitted to solve the Arab-Israeli struggle through apostasy, defeatism and slackness, through the road of giving up all the legitimate and pan-Arab aspirations, through the road of entrenching and deepening the rift in the Arab homeland and through the road of obstructing the Arab people's hopes to freedom, unity and progress and the right to choose the road of just and comprehensive peace--an Arab peace and not a regional one--that would safeguard the legitimate rights of our nation in its homeland and land, preserve its values, dignity and holy places, guarantee the future of its generations and open the road for our nation to build the united Arab socialist society.

3. To define the position toward the pan-Arab work within the framework of the Arab solidarity. This solidarity is not for defeatism and submission, but it is against the enemy for the sake of protecting pan-Arab dignity and protecting and wresting its rights from the usurpers.

4. To define the position toward the pan-Arab work and toward the plot aimed against the unity of citizens.

5. To define the position toward the citizen's constitutional rights, the foremost of which is his right to speak his opinion and to give his vote in the plebiscite to the man who will have the highest authority in the state, who will be the leader of the people and the sumbol of the homeland.

Supporting the Ba'th Party Regional Command's decision nominating President Hafiz al-Asad for president for the coming period, we proceed to this support out of our deep feelings of appreciation to the president for all his sincere efforts, devoted loyalty and tremendous accomplishments in all domains during the past 7 years, we also proceed from our deep hope and certain faith that he is still capable of giving our people all they need and aspire to achieve.

ALGERIA

PAPER REPORTS ALGERIA TO RECEIVE SOVIET TANKS SOON

NC211013Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 1003 GMT 21 Jan 78 NC

[Text] Beirut, 21 January--The weekly newspaper AN-NAHAR AL-'ARABI WA AD-DUWALI today reports that a large consignment of Soviet tanks will arrive in Algeria in the very near future in the wake of Algerian President Houari Boumediene's recent talks in Moscow.

The paper says that as a result of Boumediene's visit, Moscow has agreed to receive a POLISARIO Front delegation secretly to discuss the front's demand for self-determination for the Sahara people.

LIBYA

JANA REPORTS ON 22 JAN OIL CONFERENCE IN TRIPOLI

LD231852Y Tripoli JANA in English 1507 GMT 23 Jan 78 LD

[Text] Tripoli, January 23, JANA--The conference of Arab oil exporting countries yesterday recommended an increase in the price of oil to a limit which makes exploitation of alternative energy resources economical, to put an end to the extravagance in consumption of oil and gas, subsequently to benefit from processing them.

The conference, the tenth of its kind, and attended by all the Arab oil exporting countries and representatives of OPEC and OAPEC, also recommended that the price of gas should be linked to the price of crude oil on the basis of calorie contents and other specifications.

It said the Arab countries should coordinate their plans when conducting a dialogue with the industrialised countries to strengthen their position in negotiations to enable them to acquire oil technology on reasonable terms in the shortest possible time.

The conference also recommended the necessity of reviewing the present averages of oil production in the light of circumstances related to the world market, in order to realise a revenue in line with the development requirements and preservation of oil wealth.

The conference asserted the importance of linking oil prices with the prices of imports from oil consuming countries and with the conditions for the transfer of technolgoy, as it is apparent that Arab petroleum exporting countries, after the elapse of a period from the rectification of prices have not realised substantial benefits because of the lack of such linkage.

Whatever the technical regulations proposed for this linkage or means of payment, the conference recommended the establishment of the mechanical system safeguarding continuous compensation to Arab oil producing countries for matters affecting their revenues from realising the genuine and convenient prices ensuring the realisation of economic development of Arab countries.

The conference stressed the necessity to produce as much oil as possible to raise the standard of the Arab citizen, in all fields especially technology.

The conference observed that the determination of an alternative for oil as an energy source should not be confined to the consuming industrialized countries. Arab scientists must accordingly be encouraged to do researches on other energy resources such as solar energy.

The conference has reviewed the latest economical development since the ninth Arab oil conference, in connection with promoting the relations between oil exporting and consuming countries.

The conference stressed the necessity of strengthening the relations between developing countries and the work for a new world economic order.

The conference expressed its satisfaction about the aids offered by the oil exporting countries to the developing countries to promote solidarity between the two sides. It called on industrialized countries to moderate their intransigent stand toward the just demands of the developing countries and to offer more aid to them especially in the field of technology.

It deplored the methods used by the industrialized countries in confronting the oil exporting countries so as to (?weaken) them.

The conference reviewed the ceaseless efforts in the field of cooperation between the Arab oil producing countries, and observed that the Arab countries should work as an integral unit in the field of training research and scientific and applied research for oil industries.

The Arab countries should also promote the Arab technical capabilities in the field of construction, engineering, planning and designs for the oil projects. These countries should also start manufacturing oil equipment.

The conference called for the formation of a permanent technical committee of experts in the Arab countries to compile an Arabic oil technical encyclopedia.

The conference observed that something should be done to stop the immigration of Arab minds and encourage them to return home.

It called for increase in information and studies exchanges and holding more scientific seminars and urged Arab oil companies to exchange and second more cadres.

The conference stressed the necessity of the continuation of supporting the oil specialized departments whether in the Arab League or in the Organisation of Arab Oil Exporting Countries and the continuation of financing joint Arab projects.

It stressed the necessity of devoting the Arab oil for the service of Arab issues, topped by the liberation of occupied territories and the restoration of the rights of the Palestinian peoples.

MALI FOREIGN MINISTER CONVEYS MESSAGE TO JALLUD

LD211044Y Tripoli JANA in English 0824 GMR 21 Jan 78 LD

[Text] Tripoli, January 21, JANA--A message from President Moussa Traore of Mali for Colonel Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi was delivered here yesterday to Staff Major 'Abd as-Salam Ahmad Jallud.

The message was conveyed by the visiting foreign minister of Mali, Charles Samba Sissoko, who called on Staff Major Jallud yesterday at a meeting also attended by the foreign secretary Dr 'Ali 'Abd as-Salam at-Turayki.

Later the Mali foreign minister left Tripoli and was seen off by Dr at-Turayki.

SOVIET DEPUTY AGRICULTURAL MINISTER ENDS VISIT

LD221756Y Tripoli JANA in English 0946 GMT 22 Jan 78 LD

[Text] Tripoli, January 22, JANA--The deputy agriculture minister of the Soviet Union, Boris Runov, left here yesterday after a several day visit to the Jamahiriyah.

During his stay he held talks with Jamahiriyah officials on strengthening cooperation between the two countries in the agricultural field, specially technical cooperation.

He was seen off by officials of the agriculture secretariat and members of the Soviet Embassy in Tripoli.

BRIEFS

TRIPOLI-CUBAN AGREEMENT--Havana, January 5, JANA--Several agreements, covering trade, economic and cultural relations between the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah and Cuba were signed at the Foreign Ministry here yesterday. The agreements were drawn up in March last year during the visit of Cuban President Fidel Castro to the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah. In a joint statement the Cuban foreign minister and the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah ambassador to Cuba praised the bilateral relations between the two countries. [Text] [Tripoli JANA in English 0909 GMT 5 Jan 78 LD]

MAURITANIA

POLISARIO GUERRILLAS ATTACK FORTIFIED POST

PA241303Y Paris AFP in English 0700 GMT 24 Jan 78 PA

[Text] Nouakchott, Mauritania, Jan 24 (AFP)--POLISARIO guerrillas in a mobile column have attacked a Mauritanian fortified post at Inal, 250 kms (170 miles) northeast of the port of Nouadhibou. The post guards the vital railway linking Nouadhibou to the iron ore mining center of Zouirat. Official sources, announcing the attack, said there were no Mauritanian casualties.

The attack was launched just after dusk fell at 7:30 pm and lasted for an hour. When the guerrillas left, they were chased by Mauritanian troops.

The POLISARIO guerrillas are fighting for the independence of Western Sahara, a former Spanish colony partitioned by Mauritania and Morocco when Spain quit shortly after the death of Franco.

The guerrillas launched a similar attack on January 12 against Choum, slightly to the east of Inal. In both cases they fired mortars and heavy machine guns just as night fell, and then withdrew to the southern Sahara without suffering any losses.

MOROCCO

HASSAN GIVES PRESS CONFERENCE ON TIES WITH SPAIN

LD192132Y Rabat MAP in French 1100 GMT 19 Jan 78 LD

[Excerpts] On Tuesday King Hassan II gave a press conference devoted to the situation in Sahara and bilateral relations with Spain. He gave the press conference before representatives of the Spanish media.

[Question] Your Majesty, do you believe that the Madrid agreement is positive, that there are no faulty drafts, no gaps? Can this agreement be partially modified?

[Answer] First of all, we find it surprising that the question of the Madrid agreement should be posed in this way. For our part, we cannot ask ourselves what is the value of the Algeciras agreement. We consider that the agreements in themselves have no value except through the will of the signatories when the latter want to invest the agreements with a sacred character stamped with solemnity and continuity. On this subject we are anxious to give our Spanish friends a piece of advice, because if they insist on challenging the value of the Madrid agreement, they will succeed only in splitting Spanish history in two: the pre-Franco period and the post-Franco period. The interest of Spain, the preservation of its interests and the respect of its commitments put the Spanish [word indistinct] under the obligation of respecting the previous decisions of Spain.

We stress Spain and not the people, because people pass on and the state remains. Regarding the improvement or the amendment of the Madrid agreement, we consider that the agreements, by their nature, are not static. Every time it seems to us indispensable to add something to the Madrid agreement or to improve its range--above all in the economic clauses which lend themselves to this in the interest of the two countries--we will act in this direction to adapt it to the new dimension which we wish to give to our economic and commercial relations with Spain.

[Question] Your Majesty, according to the Madrid agreement, the Saharan people should become self-determining. In what way have the Saharan people expressed themselves on this subject?

[Answer] We have reason to believe that the Madrid agreement did not mention that. Reference is made in it to the fact that the Saharan people unanimously chose the assembly to which Spain should have entrusted matters. This assembly, however, chose to return to the motherland instead of opting for autonomy as the Spanish Government at the time wished. It is really strange that one should recognize in the members of the Saharan assembly the quality of legitimate representatives at one moment and that one should deny them this quality in other circumstances. We are convinced that the Madrid political agreement should be assigned to the archives. As for the economic agreement, it remains real, for if the political aspect is out of date, the economic aspect remains a fertile field of action. That is why, when replying to the previous question, we were anxious to underline the viability of the economic aspect of the Madrid agreement.

[Question] Does Your Majesty think that the fishing problem between Morocco and Spain is capable of being resolved?

[Answer] We think that there is no problem which cannot be solved, all the more so since the fishing problem between Spain and Morocco does not constitute a real problem between our two countries. Above all it is no problem when one realizes that Morocco has never in principle forbidden the Spanish from fishing near the Moroccan coasts. In truth, we have always wished to regulate this problem between our two countries. We should bear in mind that the fishing resources are not inexhaustible. If we have to use them with friends, priority should be given to neighbors.

Two obstacles, however, arose in our path. First, the political problems which ended with the return of the Sahara to the motherland. Second, the absence of a document regulating fishing conditions within the framework of a joint agreement established without being prejudicial to anyone. Today, we think that there is no longer any obstacle of a political or statutory nature to the application of the fishing agreement, bearing in mind that this agreement will be a source of profits to Morocco and Spain. All the more so since this agreement deals with the exploitation of long coastlines very rich in fish. As the agreement also deals with the coasts of Tarfaya to Boujdour, it will be exceptionally profitable.

KING HASSAN SENDS MESSAGE TO KING HUSAYN

LD240008Y Rabat Domestic Service in Arabic 2000 GMT 23 Jan 78 LD

[Text] King Husayn of Jordan yesterday received a message from His Majesty King Hassan II. MENA said the message concerns the development of the situation in the Arab world in the light of President as-Sadat's decision to recall the Egyptian delegation from the political negotiations in Jerusalem, and in light of the Egyptian president's statements to the People's Assembly. In his message, King Hassan II stressed the need for the Arab countries to stand by President as-Sadat in confronting the Israeli intransigence.

TUNISIA

REPORT ON DESTOURIAN PARTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE SESSION

LD220016Y Tunis Domestic Service in Arabic 1200 GMT 21 Jan 78 LD

[Text] President Bourguiba presided over the final meeting of the ordinary session of the Central Committee of the party at the Republican Palace, Carthage, a short while ago. The meeting includes the resolution issued by the session and read by Muhammad as-Sayyah and the address of Bourguiba:

Mr President, permit me to read to you the resolution of this final meeting which you have honored by presiding over it as you have always done since the formation of the Central Committee. It is the best wishes of all that you will preside over it for many years to come. The Central Committee met on 20 January in an ordinary session at the invitation of President Bourguiba.

The Central Committee heard a statement from Hedi Nouira, premier and secretary general of the party, who analyzed developments witnessed by the country in the recent months and called on members of the committee to express their views very clearly.

1. Resolution of the Central Committee:

He referred to their important role in expressing the concern of the party base as this will help the party president and the political committee to evaluate the situation and take the necessary decisions. Following this, the debate was opened and was marked by clarity. The debate continued very late yesterday night. Everyone expressed his view on the reasons for and the dimensions of the events which emerged in the country recently and the means of dealing with them to protect the gains of the nation, to defend the rights of citizens and to (?define) their future.

Remarks by various members were unanimous on the following points:

1. The dissension does not affect our national policy. The landmarks of this policy were explained by the party in its last congress. The policy is based on consultation, dialog and consent, a matter which confirms that endorsement of this policy by the national organizations has not been given until after their views had been thoroughly aired and their interests and demands expressed.

2. The main reason for the disorder witnessed by the country in recent months was due to an internal crisis within the workers organisation resulting in deviation by its leadership which has disavowed its commitments and the principles on which it was based. Signs of this deviation were manifest in its last congress. While this congress approved the social policy of the country and paid tribute to the Social Contract which was concluded by the organization's leadership with the government and other social sides on 19 January 1977, a group of elements alien to the organization which is opposed to the national concept of trade unionist work, hastened to sign a petition in which it expressed some reservations about the leadership and denounce its attitude and its agreement to the Social Contract.

While at first the leadership of the organization denied the existence of such a trend inside its ranks, it soon went along with trend. The leadership adopted the attitude of the trend's advocates, thus repudiating its former obligations and its adherence to the policy of national unity for which Farhat Hashshad died.

3. The hub of the difference with the leadership of the workers organization, which the party had previously strengthened morally, politically and socially, is due to personal considerations because we are different in our ideological options and about the method of development and the type of community.

4. The workers organization would have not headed toward this deviation unless those in charge of it deliberately resorted to violating its statute and the principles of democracy in the management of its machinery--something which has for years been in practise reflected in the falsification of elections, contempt for the views of the grassroots membership, oppression of loyal trade unionist and their (?friends), terrorizing workers and misuse of their funds.

5. The maneuvers which were deliberately staged by the leadership of the organization were not limited to the villation of this organization's sanctity, but were part of a premediated plan contrived and carried out by elements united only by arrogance, malice and aimed at debasing the economy of the country, the social system and the inviolability of the homeland.

On the basis of this analysis and the explanations made by the secretary general of the party, Hedi Mouira, in conclusion of the debate this morning, the Central Committee condemns all the elements who gathered around this plan and began to (?plot) against the nation and to (?infiltrate) the party. If it had not been for the successes of the party's development policy, there would have been no industries, workers, social gains or [words indistinct].

The Central Committee considers that the first thing the party should do in confronting the organizers of this plan and these maneuvers is to unmask their machinations and to expose their intentions against the whole people.

The best means to refute their fabrications is by:

A. Government adherence to the development policy. This policy has been pursued since the 1960's and experience has proved to be capable of dealing with the contradictions of Tunisian reality and of achieving a suitable growth rate, without which it would have been impossible for the country to attain social progress. In this connection the Central Committee reminds that the fifth plan which derives from this policy corresponds to the ambitions of our youth and provides work for them which protects their dignity and achieves a better position for those of low income in the rural and urban areas, whether they are hired labor, small farmers or craftsmen. Attaining these objectives would achieve greater social justice and limit differences between the various sections. The Central Committee, in stressing its faith that this policy corresponds to the need for building a balanced community based on the solidarity of the various social sides and the consultations in determining objectives and while feeling committed to the level of this achievement, appeals to all citizens--especially the young--to realize the requirements for building this community, to show zeal for it and to shoulder the responsibility which brings them dignity and social justice.

B. The commitment of the party and the national organizations to take all precautions which protect them from the hazards of deviation and make them secure from attempts to take them over to use them for ends other than those laid down by their base.

The Central Committee, believing that the best deterrent to deviations lies in enabling the fundamental exercise of democracy, proposes in this connection the promulgation of a law containing procedures which insure that the grassroots members can freely choose their representatives and those who attend to the affairs of their organizations in general public sessions where the vote-counting is supervised by unbiased persons. The party, based on a democratic spirit, is ready to apply these measures and to entrust men from the judiciary to supervise the voting in the next conference of the branches and the coordination committees.

C. The undertaking by the party and all organizations of national standing which have powers relating to the political, economic and social life to insure good conduct regarding the funds they collect and to refuse to extend their hands aboard. In this connection the Central Committee recommends the adoption of legal procedures to bring these organizations, without exception, under financial control to ascertain the sources of their finances, the methods of their expenditures and their disposal.

D. Government vigilance in safeguarding the constitutional institutions and in imposing respect for the law with all the rights and obligations insured for the citizens as members of the community, including the right to strike and insuring at the same time freedom of (?work).

E. Refusal of any foreign interference in the affairs of the country and of the recognition of any movement which colludes with foreign political forces to seek from these help against the lawful power in the country. The Central Committee believes that the best guarantee for the (?entity) of the nation and the continued march of development in a climate of freedom and justice is represented in the consolidation of the leading role of the party, strengthening its structure, developing the spirit of initiative among citizens which would insure greater harmony with [word indistinct], forging its links with the masses and responding to the growing generations.

PRESIDENT, PRIME MINISTER RECEIVE FRENCH CHIEF OF STAFF

LD191937Y Tunis Domestic Service in Arabic 1600 GMT 19 Jan 78 LD

[Summary] The president this morning received at the Republican Palace in Carthage Gen Guy Mery, chief of staff of the French Armed Forces, in the presence of Abdullah Farhat, the defense minister, and also the chief of staff of Tunisian land forces, Maj Gen 'Abd al-Hamid Shaykh, the Tunisian military attache in Paris and the French ambassador in Tunis. The president decorated the guest.

"This evening Prime Minister Hedi Nouira received General Mery, who said after the meeting that he reviewed with the prime minister the excellent relations of cooperation between the Tunisian and French armies, a cooperation based on a foundation of deep and pure friendship and of identical viewpoints regarding the situation in this part of the world.

"Among those present at the meeting were the minister of national defense, Abdullah Farhat, and the French ambassador in Tunis."

BEGIN ADDRESSES KNESSET ON PEACE TALKS WITH EGYPT

TA231604Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1404 GMT 23 Jan 78 TA

[Address by Prime Minister Menahem Begin at the start of a political debate on Mideast developments in the Knesset on 23 January--live]

[Text] Mr Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, members of the Knesset: Mr Speaker, please permit me to congratulate the Israeli parliament on its 29th birthday. I am one of the three or four members sitting in the house today who can remember the day that saw the start of democracy in Israel. We went to the elections 29 years ago, and we elected the founding assembly. Those were days of war and bloodshed, and despite this, we fulfilled the duty to hold a free vote and election. We came together in the founding assembly and we were joyful, for only a few months earlier we had liberated ourselves from slavery and raised our flag among the flags of the nations. We declared our national independence. On the day of the Kresset elections we declared our civil independence. I remember that great day and since then, for a whole generation, this free house has existed.

From my experience in the world this is one of the best parliaments in democratic countries. Ordinary days and great ones, calm and stormy days, sometimes difficult disputes, good friendship after the disputes--a democratic parliament par excellence. We are blessed to have such a house, and on the birthday of the parliament, I wish for it, Mr Speaker, and all Knesset members that the house continue to decide on matters of the nation, to serve as an example of freedom, freedom of speech and mutual respect for peoples near and far.

Mr Speaker, on 27 Heshvan, 8 November 1977, President as-Sadat faced the People's Assembly in Egypt and expressed a willingness to come to Jerusalem and appear before the Knesset. In that speech President as-Sadat said that he demanded two conditions from Israel: withdrawal to the lines prior to the 6-day war and the establishment of a state called Palestine. On the next day I reacted to this sudden announcement from the Egyptian president and I issued the following statement: I wish to mention that upon taking office I announced that I am prepared to meet with the Egyptian president in any place, including Cairo, in order to negotiate for the establishment of a real peace in the Middle East. Israel rejects, totally and outright, President as-Sadat's conditions of the establishment of a country called Palestine. These conditions endanger the very existence of the State of Israel. However, President as-Sadat can bring this position to the Geneva conference, just as we will bring our positions to it. Let no party make its positions a precondition to participation in the peace conference. If this is not rhetoric and President as-Sadat is really prepared to come to Jerusalem, to the Knesset, we welcome this willingness.

After several additional exchanges over 9 days and the sending of a written invitation from me to President as-Sadat, he came to Jerusalem, appeared before the Knesset and paid the important visit by a president of a state which is still in a state of war with Israel. In other words, when President as-Sadat decided to visit Eretz Yisra'el and to appeal to the Knesset and through it to our people--in fact, to several peoples in various parts of the world--he well knew what we were prepared to accept and what we were not prepared to accept under any condition.

We met in Jerusalem. During the lengthy talk at night between President as-Sadat and myself in the King David Hotel, the president told me that with respect to Sinai he promised me that the Egyptian Army would not cross the Mitla and Gidi passes.

To this day there has been no denial of this presidential statement. On the contrary, when we met in Ismailia I repeated the president's remarks and submitted them in writing for his inspection. There was total silence on the other side.

Members of the government, the deputy prime minister, the foreign minister, the defense minister, the minister of agriculture and the finance minister heard from me on that same night about President as-Sadat's statement to me, and on the basis of that statement we built our peace plan with respect to the Sinai Peninsula. The distance between the Gidi and Mitla line and the international border--between Eretz Yisra'el and Sinai--is between 180 and 200 km. However, when General al-Jamasi submitted to Defense Minister 'Ezer Weizman the demilitarization and disengagement line Egypt proposes to us upon the signing of a peace treaty, it transpired that the Egyptian line was only 40 km. Mr Speaker, I must point out that for us this difference is the difference between two worlds. No appeal, no rhetoric, however sublime, can change the fact that the Sinai Desert has been a base for aggression against Israel 5 times in 30 years. Nothing is holy about a base for aggression. On the contrary.

Therefore, we stated that in any peace treaty between Israel and Egypt the Sinai Desert would be demilitarized. I said explicitedly this to President as-Sadat. We can no longer agree that this desert again be full of soldiers, and the President made me his promise, as I have informed you.

Mr Speaker, I remember the discussion at Yalta about the future of Poland. There was a brisk discussion between the Russians on one side and the Americans and British on the other. The Russians persuaded the U.S. President that Poland was an open corridor for aggression by Germany against the Soviet Union--or against Russia--twice in one generation, and on several other occasions in the past, and we have to close this corridor. This was said by the spokesman of the Soviet Union at that time. They were not talking about a barren desert but a breathing nation and a great people. However, the view was adopted. No country should be allowed to become a base for aggression.

We have fought in the Sinai Desert five times because Egypt attacked this small people, and especially in 1948, the day after the declaration of our independence, when we had few arms, when our sons did not have the wherewithall to defend this small nation when it faced the danger of physical extermination by armies approaching its heart in the south, north and east. In 1948 the Egyptian Army was only 20 km from Tel Aviv, Mr Speaker. I met up with it in Zarnuqa. It was next to Ramat Rahel at the southern entrance of Jerusalem, the capital, and other armies fought along with it, and we were at the brink of the abyss. All this happened because the Sinai Desert was what the French call a place d'armes--a base for aggression. We will no longer, under any conditions, agree that in a peace treaty there will be a possibility for the Sinai Desert to be a base for aggression.

Therefore, from this podium I appeal to President as-Sadat to instruct the Egyptian General Staff to submit a proposal to us for the demilitarization of Sinai in accordance with his promise. His word should be credible in the relations between Egypt and Israel, and there should be no disavowal by the Egyptian General Staff of the Egyptian president's promise. In the peace treaty between us and Egypt, there will not be even one Egyptian soldier farther forward than the Gidi and Mitla line, and the whole area will be demilitarized and will insure peace for both Israel and Egypt.

On the basis of this promise the Israeli delegation, consisting of the foreign minister, the defense minister and myself, together with our advisers and aides, left for Ismailia. At the Ismailia conference we agreed--in private talk between President as-Sadat and myself--to set up two committees to continue the negotiations between our countries--a Military Committee, which would sit in Cairo under the alternate chairmanship of the ministers of defense, and a Political Committee, to sit in Jerusalem, alternately chaired by the foreign ministers. This was an important agreement.

After it was formulated I proposed to President as-Sadat that we issue a statement on behalf of the two countries, and this is what it said: [begin English] Following the historic events in the Middle East the visit of President as-Sadat to Jerusalem and the reception accorded to him by the people, the parliament and the Government of Israel, the governments of Egypt and of Israel are determined to continue their effort to reach a comprehensive peace settlement in the region. As part of such a settlement, they will negotiate peace treaties on the basis of the principles envisaged in Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338--withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the conflict of June 1967, determination of secure and recognized boundaries within which all nations in the Middle East will live in peace, free from threats or acts of force. The Palestinian Arabs, residents of Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza district, will enjoy self-rule. [end English]

When President as-Sadat heard our proposalhe said positive things about it. However, on my initiative, after he made an important observation to me--I never had the intention of ignoring it--I proposed to him that his advisers prepare a counterproposal so that we could discuss both of them and try to reach a joint and agreed proposal. President as-Sadat's advisers submitted a proposal to us. We discussed it. The Egyptian draft included two clauses, among others: First, Israel will undertake to withdraw from Sinai, from Golan, from Judaea, from Samaria and from Gaza; second, Israel will agree to self-determination for the Palestinian people. This was written in the original draft. We informed President as-Sadat and his advisers that these two clauses were unacceptable to us. As for withdrawal, nothing in 242 obliges us to withdraw to the lines of 4 June 1967, and we expalined to President as-Sadat that in the original proposal for 242 it was said [begin English] Withdrawal from all the territories [end English]. During the negotiations it was agreed to delete the word [next word in English] all, and the words [next two words in English] the territories remained. After further negotiations it was agreed by all, including the Soviet Union and the Arab countries, that the word [next word in English] the [would be deleted], and, in accordance with the well-known interpretation, the words [next two words in English] from territories remained. This does have significance if there are such prior proposals which, in both versions--and certainly in the first of them--pointed to the obligation of withdrawal from all the territories, and between a version in which these two words are removed, despite the fact that they were proposed. This means that Israel is not obliged to sign such an undertaking, and it will not sign one.

As for the term, self-determination [indistinct interjection by MK Tawfiq Toubi]. Mr Tawfiq Toubi, we have been in this house together for 29 years. Perhaps you could make a more serious contribution to the debate than an interjection. You have made your contribution and I will answer. You will not be able to disturb me. As for the term self-determination we explained to President as-Sadat that we do not want anything latent which could become a Palestinian state.

Of course, great and beautiful words can be put to bad use, and, on another occasion, I proved that this was the case with respect to the Wilsonian term of the right of national self-determination for peoples during the thirties. The misuse of this resulted in a tragedy, first for central Europe, then for Western Europe, then for Eastern Europe and then for the entire world. Therefore, we cannot accept this proposal. After a discussion between the two delegations, the formula for a joint announcement or declaration was agreed upon not containing these two terms.

Gentlemen, members of the Knesset, I will read to you the draft of the declarations, whose contents were totally agreed on by both the Israeli and Egyptian delegations at Ismailia. After a preamble, [begin English] the governments of the Arab Republic of Egypt and Israel are determined to continue their effort to reach a comprehensive peace settlement in the region. Two, within the framework of such a settlement, they express their willingness to negotiate peace treaties on the basis of the principles envisaged in the Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. Three, the two sides agree that the establishment of a just, a lasting peace requires the fulfillment of the following: to act in accordance with Resolution 242: A) withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the 1967 conflict; B) termination of all claims of states of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty and territorial integrity and political independence of every state in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force; C) guaranteeing freedom of navigation through international waterways in the area; D) achieving a just settlement of the refugee problem; and E) guaranteeing the territorial inviolability and political independence of every state in the area through measures including the establishment of demilitarized zones. [end English]

As I said, this was the joint declaration of principles of both delegations, and it was endorsed by both. What was not agreed on? There was an Egyptian proposal with respect to the Arabs of Eretz Yisra'el, whose contents I have already read, and there was an Israeli proposal, which I have also read to you. There was a discussion. We did not achieve a joint draft. After we postponed the continuation of the meeting until the next day, we, the Israeli delegation, submitted a proposal to President as-Sadat and his colleagues that each party determine its position--both with respect to substance and with respect to language--and, therefore, we agreed: [begin English] The Egyptian position is that in the West Bank and Gaza a Palestinian state should be established. The Israeli position is that in Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza district the Palestinian Arabs should enjoy self-rule. [end English] President as-Sadat read both of these drafts at the joint press conference in Ismailia.

After further deliberations, members of the Egyptian Foreign Ministry said that since no agreed and joint formula had been reached--acceptable to the Israeli and Egyptian delegations--with respect to the issue of the Arabs of Eretz Yisra'el in Judaea, Samaria and Gaza--or as they say, and it is their right to say, in the West Bank and in Gaza--we cannot agree to the issuing of the joint declaration of principles, and for this reason this declaration was not issued. However, I must stress, Mr Speaker, that both delegations in Ismailia achieved total agreement about the declaration of principles in accordance with the English draft that I have read to you.

After the Ismailia conference, Mr Speaker, and until the convening of the Military Committee in Cairo and the Political Committee in Jerusalem, remarks were made public in Egypt. In the newspaper AL-AKHBAR a journalist famous in Egypt, Mustafa Amin, published an article headlined: "The Meeting Did Not Take Place With a Representative of the State of Israel But With Shylock."

And in the article I found the following sentences: This meeting was not a meeting with representatives of the State of Israel but a meeting with Shylock--the arms dealer in Shakespeare's famous story about the Jewish usurer who wanted to cut a pound of flesh from the face of the debtor as payment of his debt. [Interjection by MK Zayyad: Mustafa Amin was tried as an American agent in Egypt.] You tell him that. [Interjection by MK Zayyad: He does not represent the feelings of the Arab people or of the Egyptian people.] That is a compliment that you should give to him. Am I to judge whose agent he is? I am not even saying whose agent you are. [laughter] So, Mr Speaker, this famous journalist maintains that Shylock wanted to cut flesh from the face of the debtor. Sometimes, when a journalist writes something inaccurate I ask him: Do you read? And he answers me: Why should I read, I write.

Every child knows that the demand was not for flesh from the face but from another part of the body. However, let's turn a blind eye to this ignorance. Still, we do remember that since Shakespeare wrote "The Merchant of Venice" the term Shylock has been used by all haters of the Jewish people in the past 300 years, intentionally. This is the way that the Jer has been depicted. Here is Shylock. They did not even read. They do not know what happened to that Jew--whose beloved daughter was taken from him, and he cried to the heavens: Restore my daughter to me. And no one answers. However, Shylock, the man who insisted on a pound of flesh from the chest, Mr Mustafa, not from the face, Shylock. [as heard]

Negotiations for a peace treaty are being conducted between us. President as-Sadat visited the Knesset, stood on the podium upon which I am standing now and said that he was coming here in order to overthrow all the barriers of preconceptions between us. At the height of the negotiations one of his aides--whom President as-Sadat released from prison and allowed to edit this magazine and the semiofficial newspaper AL-AHRAM--calls a Jew by the name of Shylock. In this way all the barriers were recreated. From the land of the Nile we can hear the famous voice, which we have heard in all the countries, of our humiliation and oppression. However, today we are in our own land and country. And this learned man, Mustafa Amin, goes on: We went to invite them to live and they came to invite us to commit suicide. Members of the Knesset, you have heard all the details of our peace plan. Did this peace plan call upon the Egyptians to commit suicide? So here you see the imaginary talk which has no foundation in reality, and it has only one purpose--to make this people hated by the Egyptian people. And this journalist goes on: The Egyptians were stunned when they heard President Carter's statements when he announced that he opposed the establishment of an independent Palestinian state. It appears that Carter, writes the Egyptian journalist, insists on continuing his international dance in which he takes two steps forward and then one step back. If his latest statement has proved that he has changed his dance--and he is now making one step forward and two steps back--we do not know if this is the fault of the U.S. President or the fault of the orchestr to whose music he is dancing. These are the defamatory remarks about the U.S. President, just because he said that the establishment of a state that would endanger the existence of the State of Israel and other free nations was inconceivable.

On 3 January 1978 in the semiofficial and perhaps totally official newspaper AL-AHRAM, an article by Mr Anis Mansur, where, among other things, he says: Drinking coffee together proves nothing. One can also drink coffee in a zoo, and even a man on death row gets a cup of coffee. After this zoological description, he continues: We know that to sit with Jews is to sit with the usurers of the world throughout the generations.

We have heard this language, both in our generation and in gerations past. The Jews are the usurers of all generations. And then he goes on: The Jews, as is their custom, doubt everything. Even if the angel of death appears before them, they will bargain for every minute. He continues: There is a joke--what a joke--that tells of a Jew who went to the pope during the Middle Ages and asked him to sell hell. The pope laughed at the Jew who wanted to make a deal which had not profit, but the Jew turned around to the good Christians and asked them: How much will you pay in order not to enter hell? What a joke! All this is taking place during the very days that negotiations for a peace treaty between Egypt and Israel are underway.

In AL-AKHBAR on 1 January 1978 there is an article which says: We must not forget that the Israelis are Israelis and that bargaining, the weaving of ploys and profit and loss considerations are part of their character and they are unable to change themselves. They are well known and we have heard them for many generations.

On 2 January an article appeared in AL-AKHBAR which said: Superiority and the right to rule the whole world as written in their holy book [presumably Hitler's "Mein Kampf"] is the dream, aspiration and line of thought of Zionism and also of Hitlerism and Nazism. This is a new version of the protocols of the elders of Zion.

There is more, but that is enough. On 11 January an article appears in AL-AHRAM containing the following passage: [Name indistinct] stresses that Begin is wrong if he believes that the Arabs will split up and that therefore he will be able to impose peace by force of arms or even by hinting about this force. Here is a quote: The Arabs can be united by another October, in all senses of the term--solidarity in war, in oil and in Arab capital. At the height of negotiations we have a threat of war--October. Members of the Knesset, we have to know that to this day the masses in Egypt are convinced that we were beaten and that they won the Yom Kippur war. We know that this is nothing but a fairytale, one of many. However, they are convinced of this. Well, we are conducting negotiations as civilized people, as equals, and then comes a threat that if we do not accept their demands we will have an October, in accordance with the Egyptian interpretation, and all those countries which participated in the October war will again attack us. A threat of war.

Later on, Mr Speaker, on 14 January, President as-Sadat's interview in the magazine called OCTOBER was published. I have the entire interview in my hands. I have read it more than once. Let me tell you--and this is a personal note--I read it and I was stunned. I asked myself: Is this the same man, Anwar as-Sadat, who came to us, spoke with us, chatted with me until 0300, and at the conclusion of the conversation he said to me: [next four words in English] You are my friend? Is this the same man who, a week earlier gave an interview to the OCTOBER magazine, which was a pleasure to read? What change occurred? Perhaps there have been two changes, because the man who told the editor of OCTOBER what I am about to read is a different man. He says, for example, that we, in the peace plan that we submitted to him are behaving in accordance with the saying--and this is how it is put here--I hope you go to sleep so that I can kill you. Our peace plan. This means that we are telling the Egyptian people, go to sleep and then while you are sleeping we will come and kill you. This is the significance of the Israeli peace plan.

The interviewer poses the following question to Anwar as-Sadat: Do you not believe that what Begin and Peres recently said after your speech in the Knesset and the remarks that both have reiterated are really a party maneuver, with each helping the other to adopt a better position from Israel's point of view?

See, the interviewer is observing the Jewish people: There is Shim'on Peres and here am I. We have differences of opinion. He is in the opposition, thank God. I am serving in this office and we have a conspiracy going together, that we are play-acting. The dispute between us is not real, and we are trying to deceive the Egyptian people. Anwar as-Sadat answers this question as follows: I know that. It appears, however, that Shim'on Peres, Golda Meir and others in the opposition have used a stranger method. They accuse Begin of ignoring the rights of the Israeli people and of giving more than he should, despite the fact that Begin has given nothing. More. As-Sadat says that the Israelis want to transfer to us part of the fear that they experience. President as-Sadat appeared here, spoke to the Knesset and met with this public and came to the conclusion that the people sitting in this house are full of fear. Furthermore, in their strange way they are trying to pass their fear on to others. These are the examples that I bring you, and they contain words of hate and loathing.

Now our friends from across the canal tell us that they, too, are Semites, and, therefore, it is not fitting to use the term anti-Semitism. This is true, certainly from a historical point of view, and President as-Sadat rightly told us in Ismailia: We are cousins. Certainly. But this term, anti-Semitism, that we are using, this is a European term. The word was coined in Germany, ladies and gentlemen, so as not to say anti-Jewish--and since that time everyone knows what this word means. This disgrace among nations, suddenly, at the height of the negotiations, after Israel has displayed good will, had prepared a peace plan which was not rejected by any of those who saw it, consisting of two parts--and I will not quote what Mr as-Sadat told me about this plan, about both parts of it.

So here you see that this ugliness which we have known for generations suddenly raises its head in the land of the Nile, and we see anti-Semitic remarks, aimed at humiliation, throughout the 12 days between the Ismailia conference--which ended with friendship and understanding, with a promise that we would conduct negotiations as equals, with the establishment of two committees to conduct the negotiations--and the convening of the committee in Jerusalem.

Two days ago President as-Sadat made a speech to the Egyptian People's Assembly. Among other things, he said the following: We have heard official Israeli declarations that negotiations should last for 5 years. You, gentlemen, are witnesses that no one in Israel has claimed that the negotiations should last for 5 years. We proposed a few months, which is certainly required. Details have to be dealt with and details are very important. Some call this bargaining--the Jews are bargaining. What do they have to bargain about? They should do as we say because I, the Egyptian president, visited Jerusalem. What are they bargaining about? It is hard to understand. It is impossible to understand. However, when did we say that the negotiations should last for 5 full years, and the whole house is witness to this.

Moreover, they wanted to turn this issue into a national issue inside Israel and with respect to the Israeli people--to take advantage of the psychological structure of this people, who emigrated to the land of Palestine and eked out an existence year after year by establishing these settlements until they became a basis for determining their continued stay and existence. Mr Speaker, this is the history of Zionism. We imposed ourselves on the land of Palestine, and I want to repeat, with all due respect to President as-Sadat, this was not so.

We returned to Eretz Yisra'el. We did not dispossess anyone of his land. We returned to our land by right and we had to build it. That is true. We had to make its barrenness fertile, as is written. By right we returned to it and built it, and we have fought for it. This is the real history of Zionism--the liberation movement of the people of Israel, and not as you spoke about it to the members of the Egyptian People's Assembly.

President as-Sadat also said, with respect to what is called the incident at the Hilton Hotel banquet, that I apologized for the remarks I made that evening. Mr Speaker, there is no shame in apologizing. I am sure that if a man makes a mistake he should apologize. On the contrary, such an apology brings him honor. However, the truth of the matter is that I did not apologize because I had nothing to apologize for. The Egyptian foreign minister was here at the Knesset. I received him kindly, as is usual in Israel. However, I (?warned) him about all these anti-Semitic quotes. The truth of the matter is that he apologized to me--especially about the term Shylock--and he told me that when he faced the tribunal in 1946 a famous Jewish Egyptian lawyer defended him and to this day he is grateful to this Jewish lawyer. That is very nice, and then, in a friendly conversation we agreed that both sides should avoid making inciting statements that could ruin the atmosphere, because the truth of the matter is that for 10 days we turned a blind eye--the members of the Knesset will remember--we did not react to the Shylock, we avoided entering a dispute with President as-Sadat over his second interview to OCTOBER magazine. However, when the Egyptian foreign minister came to us knowing full well what was written--I must point out that he informed me that he had not read the Shylock article and I believe him--but I (?warned) him about this, and we both agreed that in the future we would avoid making inciting remarks. I had no intention of promising him that I would not make a political speech during the banquet because this is the custom of the world. I will give you some examples from my experience.

I went to the United States and on the White House lawn I was received with honor and friendship by the U.S. President, but he immediately said that there were differences of opinion between us. This was an important political statement and I answered it. The U.S. President had an absolute right to say what he said and I had the right to answer and one should not panic about this. I went to Romania in August. The prime minister of that land received me with a speech at a banquet in a beautiful hall, and he told me of the political path that Romania believed in and I was not offended but I answered him. He had the right to have his say, and I had the right and duty to answer and no one was offended. I went to London. There were two banquets--one given by British Prime Minister Mr Callaghan in my honor, and the other I gave for him--and at both banquets the two of us made political speeches. This is the custom of the world.

And what did I say during that banquet? It should be remembered that the Egyptian foreign minister arrived here, landed at Lod airport--was met by our foreign minister--who had friendly remarks to make--and he immediately said, or read, that Israel should withdraw to the lines of 4 June 1967 and return, as he put it, old Jerusalem. On the following day, again in the wake of a positive and hospitable speech from the foreign minister, the Egyptian foreign minister said that we had to return Jerusalem. It was my national duty, Mr Speaker, at the customary opportunity which I had, to react to these remarks, and I explained to him and to all assembled that Jerusalem cannot be divided and that we will not withdraw to the lines of 4 June 1967 and that we will not allow the misuse of the great words the right of national self-defense. He could have responded. I did not apologize. I had nothing to apologize about and no agreement was violated, but, on the contrary, it was carried out. [as heard] Nevertheless, this is what President as-Sadat said to the Egyptian People's Assembly.

He also claimed that my remark that we had never asked either Egypt or any other people to recognize our right to exist was arrogance. Members of the Knesset, I will give you the entire stenographic record of the exchanges between the Egyptian journalists with whom I spoke and myself in the language in which they were said. Well, the Egyptian journalist--never mind his name--says to me: [begin English] We accept the right of Israel to survive. [end English] And I answered: [begin English] Thank you for this question. My dear friend, there is some miscomprehension on this issue. Probably you got so used to hostility toward Israel for the last 3 decades that you see as a great change the fact that you are kind enough to recognize our right to exist or to survive. We have never asked you to recognize this right. My dear friends, every nation has a right to exist. You know why? Because it exists and we got our right to exist from the same God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, whom you worship as we do. [end English] And further on: [begin English] Thank you, my friend. We have never asked for such recognition. We don't need it. We have the same right to exist as the British and the French and the Americans and the Russians and the Egyptians and the Syrians. [end English] I repeated these remarks to the delegation of the United Jewish Appeal from France and I stand by them.

I want President as-Sadat to hear my remarks. We are not asking, neither from the Egyptian president nor from the president of any other country, far or near, large or small, recognition of our right to exist. We have such a right and it is not in doubt. What we did ask and what we will insist on is the recognition of our right to our land and to our sovereignty over it and our right to peace and to a peace treaty. We also did this to the president. However, to my regret, we had to repeat it.

Mr Speaker, at the end of his remarks, President as-Sadat says, while mentioning his speech to the Knesset: I did not come to ask you to withdraw totally from the conquered Arab land which was conquered after [as heard] 1967--the West Bank, Gaza, the Golan and Sinai--it is obvious that we are not prepared to argue about this. No, Mr President, with all due respect, it is not obvious, it is not understandable. It is not acceptable. We have not and we will not give you or any other leader such a commitment. We must not. We will not lead you or anyone else astray, and we informed you of this position while you were here in Jerusalem and after you left this podium.

The 6-day war was a war of defense, and for this reason two rights arise from it. First, without a peace treaty the armed forces will remain in the places where they were positioned on the day of the cease-fire, or in accordance with mutual and signed agreements--and I ask the Egyptian president and the Arab leaders around us to take note that without a peace treaty no Israeli soldier will move from his guard post. Any change will be agreed upon and the change will be inscribed, written and signed in the peace treaty and nowhere else. Secondly, it is well known that in the wake of a war of defense territorial changes take place. They are legitimate in accordance with international law and practice as we saw in Europe after the two wars--after every war. These changes are a question of a peace treaty. Not by force, only by right--also the right of a peace treaty. Such a right does exist and we will insist on it.

[Interjection by MK Wilner of Hadash] There is no right to exterminate the Palestinian people, as your plan proposes. Who was the aggressor? There are differing opinions about this. I have already told you that you want to exterminate us. [as heard] I want to defend Israel by a correct Israeli policy, by recognizing the Palestinians, and they will recognize us.

[Interjection by unidentified Knesset member from Agudat Yisra'el sitting next to Wilner] There is a Jewish proverb which says: Heavens above, guard me from such friends.

[Begin] Mr Wilner, I congratulate you for having such a neighbor. However, let's go on.

[Wilner] Is there a Palestinian people or is there not? Are we exterminating the other people or are we recognizing them so that they will recognize us. Yes or no. That is the problem of peace.

[Begin] Mr Wilner, I once heard such questions from a Soviet investigating magistrate. However, today I am standing on the podium of Israel, as prime minister of Israel. And you are not in [name indistinct].

[Knesset Speaker Shamir calls on MK Wilner to remain quiet: several indistinct exchanges follow.]

[Begin] Mr Chairman, I wish to make the government's policy at this time quite clear.

[Indistinct interjection by MK Toubi of Hadash]

[Shamir] MK Toubi, I ask you to stop. You will participate in the debate.

[Begin] There is a song, I remember it Mr Tawfiq Toubi. The communists sang it: And we will be judges. You will not. So please sit quietly and let me say my piece. I do not disturb you. It does not impress me. I already sat in the dock in a place which, were you to reach it, you would not live in the Soviet Union.

[Wilner] Maybe there's still time to go there. [general laughter]

[Begin] Not maybe, you would certainly get there. I met people like you in certain places in the Soviet Union. Mr Speaker, I want to get to the end of my remarks and enough of this dispute with the two members of RAKAH.

I want to state the government's policy with respect to the events of the past few days. President as-Sadat, without any justification, and with total surprise, instructed the Egyptian delegation to the Political Committee to return to Cairo immediately. As the U.S. secretary of state informed us, we had made progress in the negotiations toward a new joint declaration of principles. Not the one that had already been agreed upon in Ismailia. We conducted negotiations. We made progress and President as-Sadat stopped it suddenly. With all due respect, there was no justification for this.

Afterward, we were asked to send our delegation, headed by the defense minister, to Cairo yesterday to continue the deliberations of the Military Committee. The government decided to postpone the departure of our delegation. Mr Speaker, when remarks like those I have read are being made in the Egyptian capital, and they are coming out of the abyss [tehom], this is not an atmosphere in which--especially after the cessation of the deliberations in the framework of the Political Committee--the defense minister of the State of Israel, the chief of staff of the State of Israel, staff officers of the Israeli army, can go to Cairo--as if nothing had happened, nothing had happened, no ultimatums unacceptable to us were delivered--to sit down and deliberate.

However, we explicitly decided and stated that if there is an improvement in the atmosphere and if there are no more attacks against the honor of the Jewish people and the Jewish state--and we have arisen, Mr Speaker, in order to fight for our people and its liberty, but we also exist in order to defend the honor of the Jewish people and we will also fulfill this obligation; we honor the neighboring people, we have written nothing of that nature about the Egyptian people, we respect the Egyptian people, we have respect for the great Arab nation and for its constribution to the culture of mankind; I made these remarks at that banquet to the Egyptian foreign minister as well--but under no circumstances will we allow the honor of the Jewish people to be besmirched. They have arisen with honor and will live with honor. We will defend this honor, for we are created for this, and for this reason we decided as we did.

We have left the door totally open to a renewal of the negotiations--both in the framework of the Military Committee and in the framework of the political deliberations, both with respect to the declaration of principles and with respect to relations between Egypt and Israel. When, during the next few days, we look and see that there are no more attacks there will be no further barrier on the path to prevent the leader of our delegation, the defense minister, and his colleagues from leaving and participating in the deliberations of the Military Committee.

Secondly, Mr Speaker, the settlements--I expressed our views on the settlements in Ismailia. I told President as-Sadat about them. Of course, Defense Minister 'Ezer Weizman gave me and the government a full and accurate report on his talks with President as-Sadat in Aswan. Of course, 'Ezer Weizman told us that President as-Sadat expressed opposition to the existence of the settlements between Rafah and Al-'Arish. It is President as-Sadat's right to oppose. I went at the head of the Israeli delegation to Ismailia, and I proposed both parts of our peace plan to him and in one of the clauses of my proposal it was said: Mr President, these settlements will enjoy self-defense because in view of the experience of our generation we will not leave any Jewish settlement without such defense. And I added: We honor your principle; we ask that you honor our principle.

It is true that in Ismailia, as well, President as-Sadat explained to us why he did not accept our position. This is the reason for negotiations. However, did they come to an end in Ismailia because of this Israeli demand? On the contrary, the meeting ended in friendship and understanding with a joint decision that this issue would be deliberated upon and that there would be negotiations, either in the Political or Military Committee. We thought that the Political Committee was the proper place. The Egyptians thought that the Military Committee was the place. This was not important. But there should be negotiations. The remarks made by President as-Sadat at the end of the deliberations at the first meeting were: I understand that you have brought a proposal to us. We will prepare our own proposal and we will discuss them both. I understand that you have difficulties. I have difficulties as well. We will conduct negotiations. These were his remarks. No ultimatum, no demand that we should behave as he wished. Otherwise there would be no negotiations. On the contrary, in the wake of these exchanges, which were most civilized and friendly, we went to a joint press conference, we explained our positions and we decided to continue the negotiations in the two committees in Cairo and in Jerusalem. Therefore, I can say, Mr Speaker, that this point was made absolutely and sincerely clear by the Israeli delegation.

As for the peace plan prior to arriving in Ismailia, we presented it to the U.S. President and the vice president, to the secretary of state and the adviser for national security affairs, to former U.S. President Gerald Ford, to prominent senators, to the British prime minister and foreign minister. All of them without exception had words of praise for this plan. I will rely only on things that were made public. Remarks were made privately and they shall not be made public today. However, the things that were said publicly are as follows: The U.S. president, Mr Jimmy Carter, said with respect to our peace plan: [begin English] There is a great deal of flexibility [end English]; [Begin translates the English into Hebrew] [begin English] a long step forward; [end English]; [Begin translates English into Hebrew] while the secretary of state said: [begin English] A notable contribution [end English]; [Begin translates the English into Hebrew] to the peace process, of course.

[Interjection by MK Wilner] A notable contribution toward a new war.

[Begin English] And a constructive approach. [end English]; [Begin translates English into Hebrew]

These were the opinions expressed, both in the United States and in the British capital: a positive plan, a good one, a contribution to the peace process. These were the remarks made. This was the assessment of the Israeli peace plan, and it will remain that way.

Speech Said To Be Softened

TA232239Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1800 GMT 23 Jan 78 TA

[Text] Prime Minister Begin apparently softened his speech compared with the draft he had prepared. In an English version distributed before the speech, it was said, among other things, regarding the expressions made in Egypt against Israel: these expressions are not only anti-Semitic and slanderous but also a repetition of what we read in [the Nazi paper] DER STUERMER at the time. In such an atmosphere of hate and incitement toward hate against the Jewish people and its state, it will be useless and humiliating for our delegation to travel to Cairo and to take part in the talks of the Military Committee.

Further on in the draft it says: I must add a warning that if these expressions are reiterated and if this insulting language is heard again, we will not be able to send Israeli representatives and spokesmen to a place where our people and country are condemned so much. These things were deleted by the prime minister, who substituted more moderate remarks.

Peres Addresses Knesset

TA232135Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1513 GMT 23 Jan 78 TA

[Address by Labor Party leader MK Shim'on Peres in the Knesset on 23 January--live]

[Text] Mr Chairman, honorable Knesset members: I sit at home and ask myself: This debate, is it held because we have, in our hearts, a serious and weighty reason to reply to severe things that have been said and written in Egypt, or is it held because it has an objective more than a cause? The objective is to open as wide as possible the peace gates that were hesitatingly opened and are now open to angry drafts. In the final analysis, I believe that the objective is much more important than the cause. We heard hard things in the past. However, this hope for peace is the one that determines things.

Despite the fact that we find ourselves in a crisis now, we should reiterate that the desire for peace has not vanished, that the chance for peace is not lost and that this house has remained united behind the wish to turn the desire and chance into a new Middle East reality.

The Alinement, Mr Chairman, will support, both in the future and in the present debate, every effort leading to peace. This I say without disregarding the intolerable setbacks that accompanied these efforts. The entire Jewish people, and I hope all Israeli citizens as well, will not be able to keep quiet about the truly intolerable attacks on the part of the Egyptian press and several Egyptian spokesmen on the Jewish people, its authorized representatives and the prime minister. I have not come across--in our press or in the words of the official representatives of Israel--remarks that constitute an insult toward the Egyptian people, its leaders, and certainly not toward President as-Sadat, who in his visit in Jerusalem gained only appreciation and honor--regardless of the not very simple past that existed between us both in words and in deeds. We did not say what Egyptian spokesmen have said: that Israel--and this is one of the harsh remarks I read in the Egyptian press--used war threats--and I am quoting here--that mention the Nazi words in the wake of Hitler's rise to power. We have not accused anyone of being a Shylock. We have not blamed anyone for pursuing the pound of flesh. We have not called any Egyptian leader arrogant.

President as-Sadat said here that a considerable part of the problems on the way to peace are problems of psychological character and that the psychological bar should be overcome. It seems to me that such talk creates this psychological bar anew.

However, Mr Chairman, when rifts are revealed in negotiations, they should not be handled by loud and insulting charges. A rift is not a tragedy. A rift is a subject to negotiation. The first attack, to my great regret, was made by President as-Sadat in his famous interview to OCTOBER. In this interview As-Sadat claims that Begin has given nothing, and, in contrast, he has given everything. I am quoting him here. As-Sadat can claim that not everything he demanded was given him, but it is impossible to claim that the Israeli proposal to restore Egyptian sovereignty up to the international border, over the entire Sinai, and to have a certain arrangement regarding Judaea and Samaria, is only nothing. It is impossible to describe things in this way. Even a person who criticizes the Israeli plan cannot accept this claim and description.

President as-Sadat says that we have not made any concession since the territories belong to Egypt anyway. However, when he says that he has given us everything, what has in fact given us? Normalization. Is normalization such an abnormal thing? Does not every people deserve to live in normal conditions, without thereby doing each other a favor?

President as-Sadat claimed that he has given us security. I would prefer to say that he has given security, through peace, to the Egyptian people and to the State of Israel, just as Israel has done concerning the two peoples. However, the president cannot claim that he can guarantee this security in the name of Syria--whose planes today are equal in number to the number of Egyptian planes--a state that, together with the Iraqis, is trying to turn the rejectionist front into a front of a military threat.

President as-Sadat gives us an underserved complement. He says that he knows the Jews to be talented merchants. I am afraid he has not looked at the budget submitted by Finance Minister Ehrlich and is not an expert on what is happening to our treasury and stock exchange. I highly recommend that the finance minister send him a reliable and comprehensive report about our economic situation and that he might look for other compliments to give us, as a people of pioneers. I must tell you that the stock of [former Finance Minister] Mr Rabinowitz is constantly rising. It seems that many of the measures he took were correct and are now yielding results. We may deserve the compliments of being a people of pioneers, builders and defenders. Were we not this, nobody could have given us the doubtful compliments which we do not deserve.

Our people are a free and democratic people. There are various opinions among them. I do not know if it will be of any use for me to deny before As-Sadat that there is no coordination between the prime minister and the head of the opposition, that the attacks are genuine and the differences of opinion deep. There is no coordination. We are proud about the fact that in the same house it is possible to battle over various views in a parliamentary way. Nevertheless, this house is united around three things: in the sincere desire for peace--on this matter I am convinced there are no differences of opinion; in the resolute decision to defend ourselves--on this matter also there are no differences of opinion; and in the vehement rejection of loud, unfounded accusations originating in a lexicon of prejudices that do not contribute to peace. I am sure that these three elements have united us and will unite us.

I want to say that I do not doubt the desire of the Israeli Government to reach a true peace. Yet, it is precisely for this reason, and I will not leave this to others, that I am not exempted from also leveling criticism at its deeds, at the mistakes it has made. This is the meaning of democracy--criticism and the drawing of lessons from mistakes made. I think that the first mistake which is constantly repeated is that of sowing unfounded optimism, of creating an illusion to the effect that all difficulties may be overcome in words, that negotiations are like a honeymoon--and when difficulties arise they are addressed to Israel. I believe that it is possible to reach a settlement in a short time--not years, surely not many years. Nevertheless, it is permisible to note from time to time the true difficulties facing us.

We and Egypt started at a point of many and grave differences of opinion. We have overcome some and others are awaiting resolution and agreement. In my opinion, one of the incomprehensible mistakes in the negotiations--and I am not talking emotionally now--made by the government is with regard to the settlement issue. I do not even begin to understand why tractors were sent to carry out excavation operations in Sinai. This is no secret; it is surely visible. What is the logic behind this? Negotiations are being conducted and the Rafah approaches are not talked of--what is talked of is the region south of it, far from it--what are the excavations needed for?

Declarations and denials. I recall that the late Eshkol once suggested to Dr Goldman [former president of the World Zionist Organization] as follows: When you make a speech, accompany it with your denial right away so that both speech and denial are published simultaneously.

On the settlements issue, we have witnessed declarations and denials of an incomprehensible scope, during the course of negotiations, at a time when negotiations are conducted and also at a time when an Egyptian delegation is sitting here and sees what we also see. I cannot even begin to grasp this. I know the problem of settlements. However, at a time of negotiations, when an Egyptian delegation is here in Jerusalem, what is the logic and point of land-clearing operations--land in areas in which we do not even think of settling? What was this needed for, what was the good of it? Why did we have to enable them to prepare a clause in an indictment against us? There are sometimes mistakes motivated by logic. Here, the mistake and logic are separate. None of the government spokesmen have succeeded in explaining to us why, at this serious and sensitive hour, the declarations and actions in the sphere of settlement have begun.

I want to say that it was necessary to reply to As-Sadat's remarks. Although I would not want to enter a contest of speeches and replies now; I cannot say that all remarks made on our part were indeed an inevitable and necessary answer. However, I will not go into this so as not to give the impression that both parties are equally to blame, as it were. As previously mentioned, today's debate in the Knesset, is not to settle accounts. If this is the intention we should start from 1948 and where will we get to then? The debate in the Knesset today is to help to reopen the peace negotiations with greater fervor. Just as we have not been deterred by a difficult past interwoven with wars, so shall we not be deterred, despite the verbal attacks, from seeing the future rising high above harmful and unnecessary talk.

For the near future I envisage two main problems facing us: differences in the negotiations with Egypt with regard to the south and a lack of a significant partner in the east. As for Sinai, as far as I understand, we are prepared to return 98 percent of Sinai territory to Egypt without any condition except for the conditions of demilitarization, which is understandable, and a buffer zone, which is vital and essential for the sake of peace. There are only two or three clauses which remain disputed. This is surely not a large percentage in the total of differences of opinion that have existed for so many years. I would like to say that for us the problem is not one of percentages since the area in question is so small. Ours is a problem of security, not of prestige. This is an area on which Jewish settlements and airfields have been built, a sort of safety belt has been built. Also, I do not accept As-Sadat's scenario to the effect that we wanted Egypt to sleep so that we could kill it. I do not know of any Israeli who wants to murder Egypt or murder an Egyptian. This is not the question. Israel has no interest in insulting or dealing a blow to Egypt, nor in taking 2 percent of the desert lands--this is not the question. On this matter we should speak reasonably using, at the least, our reason.

In my opinion, we insist on this safety belt for two major reasons: First, we have our experience from Gaza. Between 1951 and 1956, the organization that preceded Fatah--the fedayeen--established its center in Gaza and Jewish settlements and innocent people were attacked from there. It was a center of terrorism and horror. When we look at the past 10 years in two places, Gaza, on the one hand, and Lebanon, on the other--Lebanon that was trodden under the burden of terror and Gaza that was opened thanks to the cooperation between its inhabitants and us--it is possible to understand the logic behind Israel's desire to have Gaza remain Arab, living according to its own character and tradition with refugees returning to normal life, living a life devoid of a threat against both Arabs and Jews.

It is possible to understand Israel's desire that Gaza not again face the pressure of terrorist groups to again become the source of evil, for others, for itself, for its refugees and for its future. Second, it is pointless hiding this today: Iraq and Syria have today over 1,000 fighter planes. They constitute a danger to the existence of Israel. As-Sadat cannot promise us a thing in the name of the Iraqis and the Syrians. As-Sadat knows that Eretz Yisra'el is a small country along all its borders and as long as there is a real threat to its skies, there is a real temptation to attack. When there is such a threat, it is vital for Israel to maintain a defense option. I believe that it is for this that the settlements in the Rafah approaches and the airfields near them were established.

Israel did not ask that--and here I am quoting As-Sadat--Egypt give up part of its sovereignty so that Israel could defend its own sovereignty. This is not the question. Israel asks for an arrangement that will enable it to defend itself, in light of past expereience. Since the differences of opinion focus on 2 or 3 percent, we must ask with a quiet tone. Is it possible to settle the differences or not? On this matter, my full and open answer is these are not unbridgeable differences of opinion. These are differences of opinion that cannot be bridged in several ways: either by leaving the disputed issue open for additional negotiations, or by having a land redeployment [he'arkhut] that does not constitute an insult to Egypt's honor or harm Israel's security.

I saw that the government itself, in its proposal, said that after a while, let us say toward the end of the present century, which is close at hand, there would be a reexamination of things in the region. There is no rush about Sinai. This large empty desert--if it is demilitarized, if arms are removed and early warning stations operate--it is possible that at the edge of this desert that has been arid since the granting of the Torah, there will be an area of several hundred square meters whose fate has not yet been decided and which is so vital not only to our peace and welfare but also, in my opinion, to the peace and welfare of the region--since an Iraqi and Syrian temptation to attack Israel will endanger all countries and not only us.

It seems to me that progress has been made in the negotiations on the clause which seems most difficult to settle on the way to an agreement. I am referring to the issue of self-determination in Judaea, Samaria and Gaza. In fact, I am relying, in my remarks, on the U.S. compromise formula as made public, according to which the residents of Judaea, Samaria and Gaza will be partners in the determination of their future. The U.S. compromise in turn leans on a previous Israeli agreement to the effect that representatives from these territories will participate in a committee made up of Israel, Jordan, Egypt and the representatives of these territories. It seems to me that on this matter that appeared to be the most difficult, we are approaching a bridge over which these important negotiations can pass. As far as I am concerned there are no differences of opinion with respect to the fact that the problem of the Palestinian Arabs or the residents of Judaea, Samaria and Gaza, should be solved. I am no partner to the prime minister's semantic sensitivity of how to call these people, since it is not we who give names. Every man or every group of people can choose the name that represents its hidden and expressed desire. This is not the question. Again, we do not want to dictate anything insulting to them, not even in the name of the feeling of semantic justice.

In my opinion, however, the problem concerning Judaea, Samaria and Gaza is not a problem of formulas or name giving but rather one of finding a party [with whom to negotiate]. The Alinement's opinion on this matter has remained constant. The Alinement believes that there is no alternative to King Husayn--who reigns over half of historic Eretz Yisra'el and who, already today, represents a considerable part of the Palestinian residents living there--entering as a partner to the negotiations. All the more so after President as-Sadat has said that Rabat does not exist, that the rejectionist front canceled Rabat's decisions. He should be the main factor in the deliberations over the future of the Palestinians--the residents of Judaea, Samaria and Gaza--so that a solution is found to this problem under Jordanian-Palestinian responsibility.

Mr Chairman, today the heart is not inclined toward debates and remarks of the opposition. Proposals today should be positive with eyes looking forward, toward the future, not only with ears inclined to the past. In my opinion, what the Knesset must express is that we do not intend to be seized by the feeling which is increasingly nurtured in some of the communications media to the effect that the gates of peace have been locked, as it were. On the contrary, they are open and they should be widened. If we could influence the communications media, especially those across the sea, in Egypt, not to conduct a national argument that contradicts the main objective, which is peace, we would thus make a serious contribution.

With respect to Sinai, we must say to Egypt that it is possible to find a way that will not harm Egypt's respect for its land and Israel's security and existence. We have already witnessed that even in difficult situations, unforeseeable solutions are found.

As for Judaea and Samaria, the task of formulation [of proposals] should be completed as much as possible and [we should strive] to reach significant negotiations with the participation of a serious partner who, in the past, has expressed a readiness to conduct negotiations with Israel but was at the time alone in this campaign. Today he is not the only one among the Arabs. I believe that As-Sadat's demand that Israel now determine its position concerning the Golan Heights is irrelevant. Since Al-Asad is not at all prepared to take part in the peace campaign and has rejected it, of what use is it today to raise this issue?

I am convinced that there is also a large camp on the Arab side that can rescue the Middle East from war and its horrors. Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Jordan--they are supported by Tunisia and Morocco and aided by the United States--in addition to Israel which desires peace--all this can basically change the situation. The negotiations, in our opinion, can be conducted in any manner and through all channels--in a Military Committee in Cairo, in a Political Committee in Jerusalem, through U.S. mediation, through quiet dialog and without microphones--in order to reach an agreement that will open up a new era in the Middle East.

Mr Chairman, Knesset members, he who looks ahead can see the hardships facing us. However, he who looks back must admit that we have also made progress and, in my opinion, thanks to this and with the momentum of this progress, we can proceed ahead toward a full peace agreement.

Finally, I want to say something about our vote. In light of these outlines we will submit a formulated proposal and vote in favor of it. We will not vote for the government's proposal since it says, in short, that the prime minister's statement is endorsed, in which case we should identify with every word of it. We will not vote against it since we said that we will systematically and consistently support the efforts toward peace. We prefer even an imperfect plan for peace to a total failure of the negotiations. This is the logic of our vote and this is how we will behave today.

Dayan Statement in Debate

TA232251Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 2000 GMT 23 Jan 78 TA

[Text] Foreign Minister Dayan said that the real reason for Egypt's withdrawal from the political talks is its demand that we withdraw from the Golen Heights before withdrawing from Sinai. We did not want to commit ourselves to this and we did not want to commit ourselves to agreeing to a Palestinian state. King Husayn of Jordan also demands that Israel announce in advance its withdrawal from Jerusalem, agreement to a Palestinian state, the return of the Arab refugees to Israel, agreement to the immediate establishment of UN rule in Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza Strip and agreement to a referendum later.

As for the United States, Dayan said that its treatment of the negotiations is constructive and effective. The Americans want the existence of the negotiations and want progress toward a peace agreement, especially after the breach developing between the United States and the Soviet Union against this background. Usually, the United States proposes practical compromise proposals and it plays a central role.

As for the Political Committee, Dayan is doubtful whether it will be resumed in the next few days and if it does convene, it is doubtful whether its format will be similar to its past format. For the time being U.S. mediation will continue. As for the Military Committee, he believes that the Israeli Government will soon find an opportunity to renew its activity.

Further on Dayan's Remarks

TA232256Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1900 GMT 23 Jan 78 TA

[Excerpt] Foreign Minister Moshe Dayan said in the Knesset that the chances that the Egyptians will agree to even a small part of the Sinai's being under Israeli sovereignty are zero. Dayan said that he knows this after a period of overt and secret contacts with the Egyptians. He said that we have made a comprehensive proposal regarding Sinai: The Egyptian Army will be west of the Mitla-Giddi line, the central Sinai will be demilitarized and our settlements will remain under UN protection for an unlimited period and will be given an appropriate Israeli force.

Rabin, Dayan Statements

TA240647Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 0505 GMT 24 Jan 78 TA

[From the Morning Newsreel]

[Excerpt] MK Yizhaq Rabin, after enumerating one by one his points of agreement with the cabinet, made several complaints. The first was the nature of the settlement with the Egyptians over the Rafah approaches. [begin recording]

[Rabin] Is the argument over the Rafah approaches, over the area near Elat, a problem of the settlements or a problem of security? If the problem is one of security, then do not focus on the problem of settlement. This is blindness, it is injustice, it is laying Israel open, in international awareness, to an argument over settlements and not one over security. [end recording]

Mr Rabin called on the cabinet to initiate exchanges of territory in Sinai so that places such as the approaches or certain territories near Elat should not be handed over to the Egyptians. And, on the issue of the West Bank, MK Rabin again reminded the cabinet that there was also a Jordanian option. [begin recording]

[Rabin] A mistake in the approach to the solution of the matter, a mistake in the chances of advancing peace, when it is possible to combine the solution to the Palestinian question with those who are living east of it, to bring Jordan into the circle of talks, the cabinet cuts off the issue and the possibility of talking on the line of the Jordan River. It is creating a reality of Palestinian Arabs and Jewish Palestinians, leading logically to a repartition of western Eretz Yisrael. [end recording]

Even at the beginning of his remarks, Foreign Minister Moshe Dayan replied to Yizhaq Rabin's proposal for exchanges of territory in Sinai. [begin recording]

[Dayan] The chances that they will agree to the fact that a part, even only a small part, of Sinai should be transferred to Israeli sovereignty is absolutely zero. There is no chance of this. I want to say to the Knesset: We have not proposed this. We have not proposed exchanges of territory, but there were those, people in the middle, who examined this matter, and there were also the most official Egyptian sources who said, in the clearest possible way, no way--this is outside any possibility whatsoever. [end recording]

However, Dayan is convinced that the root of the problem is not the Rafah approaches. The root of the problem is that Egypt is not prepared to make a separate peace with us and is demanding that Israel agree to withdraw from the Golan Heights even before the withdrawal from Sinai. Matters, then, appear sad, but there are still the two committees, the political and the military. [begin recording]

[Dayan] As for the Political Committee, I doubt whether it will be renewed in the next few days, and if it is renewed, that it will be renewed in the form in which it acted in the past. But I believe that the issues dealt with by the Political Committee will continue to be dealt with in unofficial talks between us and the Egyptians, with U.S. mediation, even if the framework of the Political Committee is not renewed. As for the Military Committee, I hope that the Cabinet of Israel will find it possible in the most immediate future to renew its activity. [end recording]

Knesset Endorses Begin Statement

TA232053Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 2000 GMT 23 Jan 78 TA

[Text] The Knesset endorsed the prime minister's announcement at the end of the political debate by a majority of 59 against 9--of Hadash, Shelli and Alinement MK Moshe 'Amar. Nineteen Knesset members abstained, among whom were coalition Knesset Members Ge'ula Kohen and Moshe Shamir from the Likud and Mordekhay Virshubski from the Democratic Movement for Change.

Before that a proposal of no confidence by Hadash was rejected by a majority of the 95 Knesset members who were present in the hall in a vote of 90 against and 5 Hadash members in favor.

The Shelli motion gained only the support of the two members of this faction with a large majority opposed.

Only the Alinement members voted for the Alinement motion at the conclusion of the debate, and it also was defeated.

Concluding the Knesset political debate the prime minister expressed the hope that the atmosphere between Israel and Egypt will improve and that we will be able to send the military delegation to Cairo at the beginning of the week. Nevertheless, he warned that if the atmosphere is not improved we will not be able to send the delegation.

Mr Begin again said that Israel's peace proposal is good and has gained the support of international elements and, therefore, we will not cancel it now. He added that since our proposals have been rejected, we can submit other proposals, and this possibility will be discussed by the government.

Mr Begin repeated that if President as-Sadat demands that Israel withdraw from the Golan Heights, Judaea and Samaria and the Gaza Strip, and also the establishment of a Palestinian state, this means that he does not want an Israel with peace but peace without Israel.

The prime minister came out against the tendency of self-accusations in Israel, as he put it, when the enemy is disgracing Israel and publicizes things the likes of which we have not read in the [Nazi paper] DER STUERMER.

He rejected the charge that his speech in the Hilton Hotel was insulting, quoting, in this connection, Mrs. Golda Meir's remarks to the effect that it was precisely the Egyptian foreign minister who did not behave properly when he refused, on that occasion, to raise a toast to the life of the State of Israel.

MINISTER WEIZMAN POSTPONES VISIT TO U.S.

TA232235Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 2100 GMT 23 Jan 78 TA

[Text] Defense Minister 'Ezer Weizman has decided to postpone his trip to the United States until the government decides on the issue of the continuation of the Military Committee meetings in Cairo. He was supposed to leave for Washington on Thursday as the guest of the U.S. secretary of defense, mainly in order to deal with procurement matters. The defense minister told our correspondent that he postponed the visit on his own initiative after he had consulted with the prime minister.

HUSAYN TALK WITH WEST BANK PERSONAGES REPORTED

TA240823Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 0800 GMT 24 Jan 78 TA

[Text] Jordan's King Husayn has told people from the territories that he has abandoned his plan for a confederation between the two banks and that he now aims for an interim period of 2 to 5 years in which the fate of the territories would not be determined. During this period Israel would have to retreat from the territories and its place must be taken by a UN administration. The United Nations would also supervise a referendum in which the inhabitants of the territories would determine their future. King Husayn explained to his guests that he had abandoned the confederation program particularly due to Egypt's opposition. He preferred that the inhabitants of the territories themselves should decide their future. King Husayn is convinced that in a referendum the inhabitants of the territories would prefer to be linked with Jordan. This talk took place 2 weeks ago, and its contents have now been revealed to our correspondent in Judaea and Samaria, Pinhas 'Inbari.

Our correspondent has also learned that not long ago there were contacts between moderates from Judaea and Samaria and PLO representatives in Amman and in the Persian Gulf. The PLO members asked the moderates not to act in the territories in order to obtain support for President as-Sadat. They pointed out that if the negotiations advance, and if there were genuine concessions on the part of Israel on the Palestinian question, Yasir 'Arafat would change his position and support the Egyptian president. This was in spite of the opposition of rejectionist front organizations who are members of the PLO. These contacts were authorized by the Government of Jordan.

BANGLADESH

BANGLADESH-INDIA JOINT RIVERS COMMISSION MEETS

BK211724Y Dacca Domestic Service in English 1705 GMT 21 Jan 78 BK

[Text] The Bangladesh-India Joint Rivers Commission met in two sessions in Dacca today. They discussed matters relating to augmentation of the dry season flow of the Ganges.

The visiting Indian minister for agriculture and irrigation and chairman of the commission, Mr Surjit Singh Barnala, told newsmen that the deliberations started in a cordial atmosphere. He described the first day's talks as very useful. The Bangladesh delegation leader, Mr. B. M. Abbas, said the meeting also discussed procedural matters.

Concludes Session

BK241029Y Dacca Domestic Service in English 0835 GMT 24 Jan 78 BK

[Text] The India-Bangladesh Joint River Commission ended its 5-day meeting in Dacca today. A press release says the commission agreed on initial steps to be taken for the study of the proposal for the augmentation of the dry season flow of the Ganges. It also decided to take up for reexamination the proposals to be submitted by either government at its next meeting to be held in India in early April.

The commission took note of the progress of studies undertaken earlier of the problems arising out of schemes on common rivers and decided to expedite action on them through joint investigation by experts. The Indian side at the commission was headed by the minister for agriculture and irrigation, Mr Barnala, while the Bangladesh side was headed by the presidential adviser for flood control and water resources, Mr B. M. Abbas.

Addressing a joint news conference at the state guest house, the leader of the Indian delegation said a five-member Bangladesh observation team is being stationed at Farakka to study the flow of the Ganges. A two-member Indian team has already arrived and stationed at Hardinge Bridge for the same purpose. The placement of observation teams in each other's countries was provided for in the Farakka agreement. Mr Barnala said it has been decided at the commission meeting that each country will submit a scheme by the middle of March next. The scheme will then be studied by the Joint River Commission at its next meeting.

In reply to a question, the Indian delegation chief described the 5-day negotiations of the commission as satisfactory.

The presidential adviser for flood control and water resources, Mr B. M. Abbas, told newsmen that the Bangladesh observation team is proceeding to Farakka immediately. The Indian delegation later left for home.

COMMODITY EXCHANGE PROTOCOL WITH PRC FINALIZED

BK241725Y Dacca Domestic Service in English 1705 GMT 23 Jan 78 BK

[Text] Bangladesh and China today finalized the second commodity exchange protocol for the current year. The protocol will be formally signed tomorrow. The negotiation was finalized in the last round of bilateral trade talks between the Bangladesh commerce secretary and the visiting high-powered Chinese delegation led by the vice minister for foreign trade, Mr Cheng To-pin.

The meeting also discussed the report of the joint working group set up for this purpose and finalized the size of the second barter trade accord, the items to be exchanged and the value ceiling of each individual item.

Official sources said after the meeting that consensus was also reached for improved trade transactions between the two countries outside the scope of the barter accord.

The Chinese delegation met the presidential adviser for jute, Mr Saiful Azam. The adviser apprised the delegation of the progress made by Bangladesh in the field of jute with particular reference to the efforts of diversifying the use of jute.

Mr Cheng To-pin expressed satisfaction over the progress made by this country and said that China and Bangladesh would share experience in the field of cultivation and technology of jute.

INDIA

VAJPAYEE TO MAKE OFFICIAL VISIT TO PAKISTAN

LK231625Y Delhi Domestic Service in English 1530 GMT 23 Jan 78 BK

[Text] The external affairs minister, Mr Atal Bihari Vajpayee, will pay a goodwill visit to Pakistan from the 6th to the 8th of next month. The visit is at the invitation of Mr Agha Shahi, adviser for foreign affairs of the Government of Pakistan.

An official spokesman said in New Delhi today that there are no specific issues to be discussed between Mr Vajpayee and Pakistani leaders. The purpose of the visit is to establish personal contact and rapport between leaders of the two countries. During his stay in Islamabad, Mr Vajpayee will call on the chief martial law administrator, Gen Ziaul Haq. He will also visit Lahore.

The AIR [All-India Radio] correspondent says that the last visit of a foreign minister of India to Pakistan was of Mr Swaran Singh in 1966 soon after the Tashkent agreement.

DEFENSE SPOKESMAN COMMENTS ON INCREASED ARMS PRODUCTION

BK231555Y Hong Kong AFP in English 1305 GMT 23 Jan 78 BK

[Text] New Delhi, Jan. 23 (AFP)--India will be considerably increasing its production of war weapons this year.

A Defense Ministry spokesman estimated here today a 46 percent increase in arms production from 8,650 million repees (approximately $690 million) during the current financial year ending in April, to 10,000 million rupees (over $1,000 million) over the next financial year. [all figures as received]

The Indian defense industry, consisting of 280,000 workers, is the second largest in the country, after steel. Production ranges from guns and ammunition to helicopters and missiles.

PAKISTAN

HAQ ESTABLISHES 16-MEMBER COUNCIL OF ADVISERS

BK231045Y Karachi DAWN in English 15 Jan 78 pp 1, 12 BK

[Excerpts] Rawalpindi, Jan. 14--The chief martial law administration [CMLA], General Mohammad Ziaul Haq, has constituted a 16-member Council of Advisers who assumed the charge of their respective offices here this morning.

All the advisers will have the rank and status of federal ministers, a press note issued by the cabinet secretariat (cabinet division) said. Some more advisers, including two from the Baluchistan Province, will be added to the council in the "near future".

The 16 advisers, along with the business of the federal government assigned to them with effect from the forenoon of Jan 14 are:

(1) Mr Ghulam Ishaque Khan, secretary-general-in-chief: (I) functions assigned to him as secretary-general-in-chief, i. e. will coordinate [words illegible] all federal government ministries departments etc, (II) coordinate all inter-provincial matters; (III) planning.

(2) Mr A. K. Brohi: (I) law and parliamentary affairs; (II) religious and minority affairs.

(3) Lt-Gen F. A. Chishti, chief of staff to the CMLA: (I) establishment including postings and transfers of foreign affairs group, (II) Kashmir affairs and northern areas, (III) federal inspection commission.

(4) Mr Mustafa Gokal: shipping, ports and export promotion.

(5) Lt-Gen (Retd.) Habibullah Khan: (I) industries; (II) production.

(6) Lt-Gen Ghulam Hasan Khan S. J., adviser on national security: (I) labour, (II) manpower, (III) local government and rural development, (IV) states and frontier regions.

(7) Air Marshal Inamul Haq: interior.

(8) Mr A. G. N. Kazi, secretary-general, finance and economic co-ordination: (I) finance, (II) economic affairs, (III) statistics, (IV) water and power, (V) agrarian management.

(9) Mr N. A. Qureshi: railways.

(10) Mr Mahmud Ali, Chairman, National Council of Social Welfare: (I) environment and urban affairs, (II) housing and works.

(11) Sardar Maula Bakhsh Soomro: (I) political affairs, (II) commerce.

(12) Mr Mohammad Ali Khan of Hoti: education.

(13) Dr Amir Mohammad, vice-chancellor, University of Agriculture, Faisalabad: (I) food, agriculture and co-operatives, (II) livestock.

(14) Mr Sharifuddin Pirzada: attorney-general of Pakistan.

(15) Mr Agha Shahi, secretary-general, foreign affairs: foreign affairs.

(16) Rear Admiral R. M. Sheikh: petroleum and natural resources.

The press note said: The chief martial law administrator has been pleased to retain the following business of the federal government with himself:

(I) cabinet division; (II) CMLA's secretariat; (III) defense; (IV) defense production; (V) information and broadcasting; (VI) Atomic Energy Commission; (VII) health, population planning and social welfare; (VIII) science and technological research; (IX) aviation; (X) culture and sports; (XI) tourism.

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

DAILY REPORT volumes are published Monday through Friday in both paper version (mailed daily) and microfiche version (mailed weekly). Annual subscription including occasional supplements is, for the first volume, $125 paper/$100 fiche; each additional area volume up to seven, $70 paper/$60 fiche; all eight volumes $575 paper/$500 fiche. Foreign subscription for the first volume $160 paper/$125 fiche; each additional area volume up to seven, $70 paper/$60 fiche; all eight volumes for $610 paper/$525 fiche. Each additional paper or fiche subscription beyond eight is $50. The volumes are: I—People's Republic of China; II—Eastern Europe; III—Soviet Union; IV—Asia & Pacific; V—Middle East & North Africa; VI—Latin America; VII—Western Europe; VIII—Sub-Saharan Africa. Back issues or single copies are not available. Allow 30 days for processing new subscriptions. Mail remittances, inquiries, and address changes to the NTIS address below.

Note: The publications of the Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS), which are sometimes cited in the DAILY REPORT, can also be ordered from NTIS in single copies or by subscription. In ordering, please cite the JPRS title, number, date, and author if applicable.

Both the DAILY REPORT and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at public and university libraries throughout the United States.

N T I S

National Technical Information Service
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Springfield, Virginia 22151